

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW,  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXI. — JULY, 1869. — No. 2.

---

ART. I. — THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. No. I.

A CLERGYMAN, deriving his stipend from the Anglican Church, has recently assailed the Anglican Reformation. He asserts that it ruthlessly abolished Catholic ceremonies. He avers that its martyrs were inferior in principle to the bloody revolutionists of France. He describes it, in its characteristic aspects, rather as a midnight cloud than a morning sun, — a deluge of woe more than a visitation of mercy, — a retribution, not a progress. He confines its benefits to the circulation of the Scriptures, the translation of the Liturgy, and the restoration of the cup in the Holy Communion. A most estimable and eloquent American clergyman, forgetting that the English Reformation was simply ancient Catholic truth arrayed against innovating Romish error, has, in the light of three centuries, sweepingly asserted that Protestantism is a failure, and not discriminating between Anglican conservatism and continental radicalism, at once uselessly excited denominational prejudice, and obscured the glory of a movement sanctified in the blood and fire of British martyrs. The period has therefore arrived when the motives, the principles, the actions of our fathers must be scrutinized. We must dig about old foundations. We must examine germinal truths. We must trace the origin, the progress, the results of a religious revolution, which has changed

the face of Christendom, affected the social, the political, the literary, the ecclesiastical future of the world, and which, touching all time, will be felt through all eternity. We propose to unravel separately the various threads in the tangled skein of the English Reformation, as they wind through the centuries, and now begin with the mighty struggle excited by the claims of the *Papal Supremacy*. This is the more necessary since the children seem utterly forgetting the history of their fathers. Let us go back to the origin of the Papacy, trace its rise, its success, its pretensions, its contests, and that final overthrow in England which emancipated the human mind on the old continent from centuries of bondage, and enabled it in the new to start forward on a career of progress, whose legitimate result for the whole world is the promised millennial glory.

As no man could have predicted that the pure inculcations of our Saviour could have been distorted into a system of Jesuitism, sanctioning every unnatural crime, including murder, and exceeding in atrocity all the horrors of paganism, so no man could have predicted that from the spiritual kingdom established by Jesus Christ would have arisen a haughty domination, essentially earthly, the scarlet of whose modern Popes has flushed into a more arrogant pretension than was indicated even by the purple of the ancient Emperors. Yet such, demonstrably, is an historic fact.

We perceive in the first college of the Apostles the Primacy of St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem. This was evidently due to the place which was the venerable centre of two dispensations, and which witnessed the labors of prophets, and was associated so sacredly with the history of our Lord, and the baptism of Pentecost. Nor is it strange, when the holy city became a ruin, that ecclesiastical precedence should be transferred to the imperial city, at once the metropolis of the empire, and the mistress of the world. For the nature of the Romish Primacy we must look, not to the oratorical eulogies of the fathers, or the flattering appeals of contesting parties, but to the standards of the ancient councils. Here is law, not opinion. Here is authority, not speculation. Here is to be ascertained both the doctrine and the government of the pure centuries in the Primitive Church. It is useless to wander through the darkness of the night, and the mazes of the forest, when we may have the light of the sun, and the convenience of the highway.

The sixth canon of the Nicene Council ordains : —

“Let the ancient custom be preserved that exists in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority in all these countries, since that has also passed *into a custom* for the Bishop of Rome. Let the churches at Antioch, and in the other provinces, preserve also their privileges.”

Here a certain superiority is assigned to the episcopate of the imperial city. But mark ! it is not described as of apostolic origin. It is not derived through St. Peter. It is not even exclusive in its claim. It is ascribed to *custom*. It is to be extended only over countries contiguous to Rome, and a similar privilege is also granted to the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch.

The Council of Constantinople decreed as follows : —

“Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the *primacy of honor* after the Bishop of Rome, *because* Constantinople is the new Rome.”

Here we have expressed both the nature and the principle of precedence. It is not divine. It is not authoritative. It is not essential. It is a privilege of *honor*. It originates in the venerable character of the old metropolis, and contains, if not a prophecy, at least the principle of transfer to the new metropolis of the empire.

We now reach the fourth Œcumenical Council assembled at Chalcedon. Here we find more fully expressed the germ and the genius of the Romish Primacy. The twenty-eighth canon says —

“In all things following the decrees of the Holy Fathers, and recognizing the canon just read by the one hundred and fifty Bishops, well-beloved of God, we decree, and establish the same thing touching the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, the *new* Rome. Most justly did the fathers grant *privileges* to the See of the ancient Rome, *because she was the reigning city*. Moved by the same motive, the one hundred and fifty Bishops, well-beloved of God, grant *equal privileges* to the most holy See of the new Rome, thinking very properly that the city that has the honor to be the seat of empire, and of the Senate, should enjoy in ecclesiastical things the same privileges as Rome, the ancient queen city, since the former, although of later origin, has been raised and honored as much as the latter.”

Here the Primacy is considered not a right, but a privilege. Nor does it involve the confusing investigations as to whether St. Peter, or St. Paul, or both, planted the Church in Rome. It is

not necessarily connected with the place made sacred by apostolic martyrdom. It is not based on any of the reasons assigned by modern Papists. The whole foundation of the claim is the glory of the ancient metropolis, and when a new city arises, founded in a new place by a new Emperor, neither sanctified by the labors, or the sufferings of Apostles, an Œcumenical Council authoritatively decides that it shall share with the old an honor derived from *custom*, and not referred to Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church.

That this view is historically correct can be demonstrated from the very constitution of the Œcumenical Councils. Were these convened by the Bishop of Rome as entitled to an absolute supremacy? Was he the source of their power? Was he the central object of their history? Was he the presiding officer in their deliberations? Nay! They were not assembled in his name. They did not act from his authority. They did not deliberate under his special supervision. *Now*, the Pope claims to be the heart, the brain, the sun of the entire system, whence life, and truth, and light are diffused through all the extremities. From him are derived the powers of Deacons, Priests, Bishops, Archbishops, Metropolitans. Not even regarding temporal sovereigns, he himself assembles a Council of the Vatican, and will evidently be its pervading spirit. This logically results from the asserted supremacy of his visible headship. But how was it in the days of the venerable Œcumenical Councils? *Then*, these august ecclesiastical assemblages were convoked by the Emperor, and exhibit no trace of supremacy in the Roman See, whose Bishop was not always even a secondary personage. Nay! The Fifth Council excluded Vigilius from the fellowship of the Church, only restoring him when he retracted his errors; while at the Sixth, the Emperor occupying the first place, on his *right* were the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, while on his *left* were the delegates from Rome and Jerusalem.

Nothing can better demonstrate or express the truth on this entire subject, than the letter of Gregory the Great rebuking John, Bishop of Constantinople, for assuming the title *universal*, which, granted to the Bishop of Rome as a mark of honor by the Council of Chalcedon, had yet never been employed, because it wore the appearance of arrogance. This Pope, at once eminent for his learning, his genius, and his holiness, writes in a strain of noble protest: —



"Therefore, dearly beloved brother, love humility with all your heart. It is that which insures peace among the brethren, and which preserves unity in the Holy Catholic Church. If St. Paul could not bear that the members of the body of the Lord should be attached piecemeal to other heads than that of Christ, though those heads were Apostles, what will you say to Christ, who is the Head of the Universal Church — what will you say to him at the last judgment — you, who by your title of *universal*, would bring all his members into subjection to yourself? Whom, I pray you tell me, do you imitate by this perverse title if not him, who, despising the legions of angels, his companions, endeavored to mount to the highest, that he might be subject to none, and be above all others, who said, 'I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High?' For my part, when, through my tears, I see all this, I fear the secret judgments of God; my tears flow more abundantly; my heart overflows with lamentations. Peter, the first of the Apostles, and a *member* of the holy and universal Church; Paul, Andrew, John, were they not chiefs of certain nations? And yet all are *members* under *one only head*. In a word, the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace, do they not all constitute the body of the Lord? Are they not all members of the Church? Yet is there not among them who desired to be called *universal*. Yet, know it my brother, hath not the Council of Chalcedon conferred the *honorary* title of *universal* upon the Bishop of the Apostolic See, whereof I am by God's will the servant? And yet none of us have permitted this title to be given to him; none hath assumed this title, lest by assuming a special distinction in the dignity of the episcopate, we should seem to refuse it all the brethren."

Afterward, as recorded by Anastasius the Librarian, Boniface III. —

"Obtained from the Emperor Phocas that the Apostolic See of the blessed Apostle Peter, that is to say, the Roman Church, should be head of all the churches, *because* the Church of Constantinople wrote that she was the first of all the churches."

From this period the arrogant pretensions of the Papacy continually increase. By artful intrigues, by haughty assumptions, by the False Decretals, by the endowment of Pepin who laid the keys of conquered towns on the altar of St. Peter, and the influence of Charlemagne who kissed its steps as he ascended, by treaties, by alliances, by wars, by excommunications, the Bishops

of Rome arose amid the wild convulsions of Europe, to a height of power from which they anathematized princes, deposed kings, excluded empires from the privileges of the Church, and claimed to have both the sceptre of the world and the keys of eternity. As Dr. Littledale does not include among the blessings of the English Reformation the overthrow of the Papal Supremacy, and thus virtually acknowledges the legitimacy of its title, and himself as its lawful subject, it may be well to refresh him and his disciples by quotations from Romish standards, which will show the past pretensions of their admitted master, and his present infallible claims to a universal power. If we here refer only to those authorities which exalt his arrogance to the highest limit, it must be remembered that ultramontaniam has now the ascendent in the Vatican.

Bellarmino says, in regard to the opinion that the Pope has "supreme power over the whole world, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs," that it was maintained by "Augustinus Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius, Panormitanus, Hostiensis, Silvester, and many others." The first of these, in the preface of a work on Ecclesiastical Power, dedicated to Pope John XXII., and extracted by Barrow, writes:—

"It is an error not to believe that the Roman Pontiff is pastor of the universal Church, the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, and that he hath not universal supremacy over temporal and spiritual matters."

Thomas Aquinas says:—

"In the Pope is the summit of power. When any one is denounced excommunicated by his decision on account of apostasy, his subjects are immediately freed from his dominion, and their oath of allegiance to him. The Pope, by divine right, hath spiritual and temporal power as supreme king of the world; so that he can impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and castles for the preservation of Christianity."

The Ecclesiastical Dictionary of Ferraris, a standard of Romish divinity, asserts:—

"The Pope is of such dignity and highness that he is not simply man, but as it were God, and the vicar of God. Hence the Pope is of such supreme and sovereign dignity that, properly speaking, he is not merely constituted in dignity, but placed on the very summit of dignity. Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven, earth, and hell. Nay, the Pope's excellence and power is not only about heavenly,

terrestrial, and infernal things, but he is also above angels, and their superiors. He is of such great dignity and power, that he occupies one and the same tribunal with Christ, so that whatsoever the Pope does, seems to proceed from the mouth of God, as is *proved from many doctors*. The Pope is as it were God on earth, the only prince of the faithful of Christ, the greatest of all kings, possessing the plenitude of power, to whom the government of the earthly and heavenly kingdom is entrusted. Hence the *common doctrine* that the Pope hath the power of the two swords, namely, the *spiritual* and the temporal, which jurisdiction and power Christ himself committed to Peter and his successors."

Baronius, the annalist, asserts : —

"There can be no doubt that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal. God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual Church."

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, inculcated a similar doctrine, and was approved by contemporary and subsequent Popes. Charles Butler asserts that this is the view of transalpine divines, who, residing near Rome, best knew the opinions of Rome. Benedict XIV., in his work on Synodical Affairs, says : —

"The Pope is head of all heads, and the prince, moderator, and pastor of the whole Church of Christ under heaven."

Peter Dens makes similar assertions. Nor are these mere theories. Again and again in the history of our world have infallible Popes given them practical application. In the year 730 Gregory II. excommunicated Leo Isaurius, and released his subjects from their obedience. Hildebrand hurled his anathemas at the head of the refractory Henry in the following terrible words : —

"In the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from imperial and royal administration King Henry, son of Henry, sometime Emperor, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on this Church, and I absolve all Christians subject to the empire from that oath, whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true kings, for it is right that he should be deprived of dignity, who does endeavor to diminish the majesty of the Church."

Urban II. inculcated the deposition of refractory emperors. Innocent II. asserted that the "pontifical authority exceeded the royal power as much as the sun the moon." Gregory IX. excommunicated the Emperor Frederic II. and all his supporters, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, interdicted his cities, castles,

villages, and commanded his ball to be published with ringing bells, and lighted and extinguished candles. We need not mention the papal thunders directed against John, and Henry VIII., and Elizabeth of England. If infallible Popes claimed and exercised this power in the past ages, infallible Popes may claim and exercise it in the present century. And we should remember that, although this arrogant usurpation of authority has been veiled and softened by the spirit of our era, and the curtailed dominion of Rome, it has never yet been denied, or retracted by the Vatican. It is deducible from the very theory of the Papacy, and however it may be forced to slumber, will always break forth when required, or permitted by circumstances. Besides, every liberal spirit must resist even an abstract pretension to a power which would enslave him to any single human will. Yet Dr. Littledale and his followers seem wholly to have forgotten the mighty struggle which, after centuries, often amid blood and flame, finally freed England from the most hateful spiritual and temporal usurpation which has ever darkened our world.

Before, however, we approach the Anglican contest, we must remark that it was the claim to universal supremacy by Rome, rather than any difference in regard to the Nicene Creed, which, by creating the great Oriental and Western schism, has so long divided Christendom. In the correspondence between Photius and Nicholas, which preceded their mutual excommunications, and terminated in a final rupture, the whole question involved was the Papal Sovereignty. Nor in their letters can we fail to contrast the mildness, the charity, the dignity of the Greek Patriarch, remarkable at once for his genius, his learning, and imperial relationship, with the haughtiness, the rudeness, the assumption of the Roman Hierarch. Photius expostulates; Nicholas commands. Photius is tender; Nicholas is furious. Photius concedes a certain Primacy; Nicholas demands an absolute headship. Photius often entreats; Nicholas always thunders. Nothing can be clearer than the fact that it was the inordinate pride and violence of Rome, pushing her usurped title to supremacy beyond all law, all precedent, all reason, all endurance, which erected between the Greek and Latin Churches a barrier of separation almost impassable. On the head of her Pontiff rests the guilt of a schism which has darkened and disgraced Christendom. This has been for centuries the perpetual accusation of the Orientals, and to this point was prin-

cipally directed that recent dignified rebuke of the Patriarch, which so effectually silenced the emissaries, inviting him to the coming Council of the Vatican. But before leaving this part of our subject, we can scarcely avoid alluding to a distinguished Anglican pervert, whose bold letter, touching the several points of difference, shows a spirit in palpable antagonism to the whole Roman system, which will never be enslaved to the Roman obedience, and which will more effectually shake the Roman usurpation than all the argument and denunciation of the Protestant world. It is not the shell exploding in the air, around the walls, and above the turrets of the castle, which inflicts injury, but that buried amid its foundations, which will hurl it into fragments. Mr. Ffoulke's remarkable appeal to Archbishop Manning invoking the Papacy to repudiate the False Decretals, which are the very basis of its usurped domination, and thus take the first step towards restoring the unity of Christendom, may possibly show Dr. Littledale that other benefits than the circulation of the Bible, the translation of the Liturgy, and the restoration of the cup, were achieved at the Reformation by that Church he has sworn to sustain, and which so long and so successfully carried forward a protesting opposition to the sway of the Pope. And this leads us to the heart of our subject. We will now proceed to show that as the haughty and unwarrantable assumptions of Rome chiefly caused the great Greek schism, so they also chiefly caused the great Anglican schism.

As the Romish system exhibits on the stock of a Primitive Christianity the branches of a pagan mythology, so the Pope-King is a reproduction of the Pontiff-Emperor, only uniting in himself more closely the temporal and spiritual dominion, and claiming a more extensive jurisdiction. It was not to be expected from the constitution of human nature that such a power would not be resisted. Indeed it was born amid tumultuous, often bloody struggles. There was scarcely a nation in Europe where were not angrily debated questions of appointment, investiture, annates, and appeals. The historic Gallic antagonism has been for centuries an hereditary virtue. The recent dissolution of the Austrian Concordat, and the unexpected hostility of the Spanish revolution, but dimly display the resistance of past ages and many countries to papal aggression. But nowhere was an opposition encountered so powerful, so constant, so successful, as in Britain. The spirit

of the island was exhibited when the galleys of Julius Cæsar anchored along its shores, and the chariots of the bold barbarian were hurled on his surprised and shattered legions. The Celtic genius embodied itself in Caractacus, who, in chains, walking amid his weeping family, unawed by the yells of the crowd, or the splendor of the pageant, defied triumphing Rome before her majestic Capitol. When, centuries after, Augustin brought from the same haughty city another gilded yoke, and another bannered ceremony, it was only by the *sword* that he could impose the dominion of the Pope. Amid all the convulsions incident to Saxon usurpation, Danish tyranny, and Scottish invasion, there was, perhaps, never a period when the Church of the Primitive Faith and Order did not live somewhere, protesting against a hateful foreign authority. When, after the Norman Conquest, the holy Anselm wished to receive from the Pontiff his Archiepiscopal pallium, William II., bursting with rage, furiously exclaimed: "Could he be ignorant that to acknowledge any prelate for the Pope, before he had been acknowledged by the sovereign, was a breach of allegiance? This was the peculiar prerogative of the Kings of England. To dispute this right was to tear the crown from his head." Henry I. had scarcely ascended the throne when a difference arose concerning investitures, whose termination left the Pope a shadow, but the monarch the substance of the disputed right. The fourth article of the Constitutions of Clarendon, to prevent appeals to Rome, forbade every "dignified clergyman" from going beyond the sea without the King's permission, and the blood of the martyr Becket staining the altars of the Church showed to what lengths of murderous crime, even in the mediæval ages, England might be hurried in resisting an unlawful ecclesiastical pretension. When the dastard John, trembling before the excommunication of Innocent, and the threatened invasion of Philip, swore, as a vassal, fealty to the Pope as his feudal lord, the indignation of the nation was boundless, and Magna Charta was forced by the barons from their craven monarch. The Act of Provisors, making void all ecclesiastical appointments contrary to the rights of the realm, and the Statute of Premunire, prohibiting, under severe penalties, any translations, processes, excommunications, bulls, or other instruments to be procured from Rome against the Crown, were simply expressions by Parliament in legal forms of that hereditary spirit which always aroused England against



any unauthorized domination. But it was in the reign and person of Henry VIII. that the historic opposition of the nation attained its development and consummation. Indeed, it is only in this view we can at all comprehend the stormy career of this illustrious monarch. Missing this clew, his character and conduct seem involved in mazes hopelessly inextricable. Let us pause then for a moment to consider the earlier relations between the English King and the Roman Pontiff. The former had ascended his throne amid the acclamations of his people, and the applauses of Europe. He seemed to unite in himself all that could make his reign prosperous and splendid. His person was majestic. His manners were princely. His mind was cultivated. His soul seemed shaped in a royal mould. The sceptre, the crown, and the throne, appeared his right as well as his inheritance. When the young monarch, with sword, and helm, and plume, a spectacle of youthful manhood, glittering in gold, sat on his pawing charger before gay circles of knights and ladies, or rushed with poised spear into the mock battle, or knelt to receive from fair hands the crown of victory amid the plaudits of his nobles, it was not understood that in that playful kingly gallant was a will of power which was to defy the superstitions of ages, dare the excommunications of the Pope, and secure the final emancipation of his realm. The beautiful tiger was only playing with his mates in the quiet of the forest. His fang was yet harmless, and his claw was yet unstained. He was only admired for the grace of his movements, the elegance of his form, and the promise of his future. It is in the indomitable purpose of Henry we find his chief characteristic, and the great qualification for his mission. We do not defend his conduct. He was an essential tyrant. However he may pretend to conscientious scruples in regard to his first marriage, it is difficult to believe that the tempting beauty of Anne Boleyn did not haunt his dreams. We are willing to admit that the passion of an uxorious monarch was the political origin of the Reformation. Nor is it the object of this Article to asperse any Romanist, or defend any Protestant. We wish to separate the work from the workmen. We wish to consider results rather than agencies. We wish to show that God can achieve his plans as well through the passions as the reason of men. Such discourses as that of Dr. Littledale are simply confusing, because they involve the glory of a divine purpose in the mists of a human infirmity. Malarious

exhalations do not touch the circles of the sun. The vilest crimes of earth often achieve the most beneficent councils of Heaven. The murder of our Redeemer was the salvation of our world. In our view, Henry, a gay, brilliant, chivalrous gallant, made unhappy by domestic discord, became first, at least in heart, an adulterer, and at last, in fact, a tyrant. Catharine of Arragon was a pure and excellent woman, to be respected for her queenly opposition to a divorce, which declared before Europe that her marriage was void, and her child illegitimate. Only contemptible prejudice can refuse sympathy for her sorrows, or indignation for her wrongs. On the contrary, nothing relieves Anne Boleyn from the stain of incest but the suspicion that the juries of England might be made the tools of murder, as the Parliaments of England were made the instruments of oppression. The truth is, it was a coarse, corrupted, adulterous, disgusting age, and men, by its standard martyrs, are by our standard villains. Nothing so demonstrates the blasting influences of Rome, and the necessity of a reformation, as that centuries of supreme spiritual sway produced such a people, such monks, such nuns, such priests, such prelates, such courtiers, such judges, such nobles, such monarchs. Amid the darkness we must confess that the home of More shines as a pure star, and his character, notwithstanding his persecutions, exhibits the mild majesty of virtue. As he lived in integrity, so he died with dignity. We must even admire the courage of the narrow Fisher, who surrendered his neck to the executioner, rather than his principles to the King. Cranmer we partly condemn, and partly venerate. He was a mixed character; clear in intellect, weak in moral purpose; often placing interest before right; yielding his convictions rather than his life; preferring, sometimes, the smile of Henry to the approval of his Master; interpreted in the fires of his own martyrdom, where he only confessed the truth after repeated lapses, and showed by his burning hand the heroism which should have been displayed in his refused recantation. Even Latimer, and Ridley, and Hooper were not stainless. Still, as their earthly weakness was purged away in the flames of a painful death, and they have ascended to a crown which will be acknowledged before the universe, we do not envy the man who evidently delights to stir their ashes that he may blacken their memory. We have thus admitted all that Romanists have ever asked, and more, perhaps, than Protestants have ever granted. This logically will little

avail a cause disgraced with the crimes of the Borgias, the blood of the Waldenses, and the murders of St. Bartholomew. However, conceding that persecutions, according to the spirit and maxims of the age, were too frequently indulged by both parties, and carefully discriminating between agents and results, let us return to the commencing struggle between Henry and the Pope. Nor must we suppose that religious principle urged the English monarch to the contest. The power animating his heart was simply the hereditary national spirit, attaining the height of its development in the imperious will of a strong man, in whose veins flowed the mingled blood of York and Lancaster, and who was the incarnated genius of England. Henry lived and died a Romanist. He declared his faith in the bloody articles. Indeed, he vindicated his orthodoxy by his persecutions. When he gave the adherents of the Papal Supremacy to the block, he gave the opposers of the papal doctrine to the flames. If the axe brought his faith in question, it was to be vindicated by the fagot. Henry would more speedily burn heretics denying transubstantiation, or purgatory, than even Clement. The aim of the English King was political, not religious. Ecclesiastical tribunals were reformed, because they oppressed his subjects. Ecclesiastical tributes were stopped, because they drained his kingdom. Ecclesiastical houses were dissolved, because they injured his people. Ecclesiastical supremacy was resisted, because it touched his prerogative. The struggle was, with him, not truth against error, but the crown against the tiara. Had it not been for the selfish passions and political interests of Henry, England might to-day see her throne linked as an appendage to the chair of St. Peter. Nothing can be more marvelous than that such a devotee of Rome should be employed to emancipate his realm from the chains of Rome. Indeed the result was antecedently improbable. The whole condition of Europe exhibited a scene of contrarieties. How strangely inverted the relations of the chief royal personages in this stupendous drama, involving in its catastrophe the whole future of our world! The Emperor Charles, whose throne was to prove the strongest temporal support of the Papacy, after surrendering the imperial city to be pillaged by German Protestants, had permitted the frightened Clement to escape from his imprisonment, and he was now dwelling in a ruined castle, awaiting the events of Fortune. Francis, whose kingdom was destined to the closest alliance

with Rome, broken by the disasters of Pavia, sought the interests of France, and not the integrity of the Church. Henry VIII., soon to hurl the papal power from his kingdom, and shatter it for all time, was now styled "Defender of the Faith," and regarded with peculiar affection by the Pontiff. But we must examine yet more closely the position of affairs in England, and on the continent, if we would understand the import of a mighty struggle, which, originating in the disappointed desires and imperious will of the father, was to be illuminated in the Smithfield fires, kindled in the reign of one daughter, and finally to be buried in the ocean with the proud Armada of Spain during the reign of another daughter.

The day had perhaps passed when Henry was to be scared by the thunders of the Vatican. And yet papal fulminations were still formidable. Believing in all the dogmas of the Church, it was certainly not an agreeable prospect to the monarch to be declared excommunicated; to have his kingdom laid under interdict; and his subjects absolved from their allegiance. No English ecclesiastic, with ringing bell, and lighted and extinguished taper, would indeed dare to give his soul to Satan, and place his realm under the law. Still the priest, in sullen submission, and in direct opposition to the papal decree, would have to bury the dead, administer the sacraments, and perform all the offices of Religion. It required therefore no ordinary vigor and independence for a monarch receiving the dogmas of Rome to dare the anathemas of Rome. The shadows of the past were still upon the world. But if the appeal had been merely to superstitious fears, the bolts of the Church, hurled from the Vatican, would probably have exploded in the air, and fallen before his throne harmless and despised. There were, however, other, and far more fearful perils. Charles and Francis might unite to sustain the Pope. Ships and armies from France and Spain might cross the channel. Scotland might rush over the border. Ireland was always ready to burst into a flame. Indeed, nothing but the insular situation of England could have rendered the contest possible. Her cliffs and her waves were her girdle of protection. On the continent, Rome would soon have crushed the rebellious monarch. But within, the kingdom was a volcano. For nearly a century after, the majority of the people had a lingering affection for the awful and imposing rites of the old superstition, whose magnificence contrasted with

the simplicity of the restored religion. The Parliaments seem merely to have yielded to the pressure of the King's overwhelming will, and when in Mary's reign Cardinal Pole pronounced the national absolution, that body which had torn away the papal yoke voted with enthusiasm for its restoration. During four reigns, there was always a formidable number of nobles who hated Protestant rule, Protestant doctrine, and Protestant ceremony, and who were ever ready to kindle the flames of rebellion, and in their glare to plant the power of the Pontiff on the ruins of the throne. This is proved by the speedy, the resistless, the triumphant restoration of Mary. Even Elizabeth held her crown by a miracle. Her only salvation was the jealousy of France and Spain, and she was never secure until that formidable conspiracy was crushed, which brought to the block the Duke of Norfolk and the Queen of Scotland. The temper of the Bishops towards Henry was never favorable. Except Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and a few others, the ecclesiastics of England were with the Pope. They bowed with secret curses to the hateful supremacy of the King. They only loved the benefices of the Church more than the head of the Church. Indeed, as a body, they seem too contemptible to have been trusted. Who ever sank into a more abject degradation than the men resigning their offices, and consenting to accept from a temporal monarch the right of a spiritual administration? Even the Reforming Bishops, in the general tenor of their lives pure and pious men, yet exhibited faults, and committed errors, which are only hidden in the brightness of those flames through which they mounted into heaven. If to all the elements of danger surrounding Henry we add the fiery fanaticism of monks, stimulated by losses and by visions, and fanned into reckless madness by the wild vaticinations of the maid of Kent, we will begin to comprehend the perils from within and from without, by which he was to be encompassed in his struggles with the Papacy. It was a battle not only for his throne, but for his very life. It was a battle against superstition. It was a battle against the masses of his people. It was a battle against the inclinations of a majority of his Bishops, and his nobles. It was a battle against multitudes of priests, monks, nuns. It was a battle against Europe. It was a battle against that venerable ecclesiastical system, which claimed the Pope for its head, and the world for its dominion. It was a battle, too, where nearly all the convictions of

his mind were on the side of his enemy, with whom he disagreed on but a single point. It was a battle where Henry had to fight *alone* against such an array of prejudice and of power, assisted by foes external and internal, as, perhaps, no other man in the history of our earth has ever had to encounter. Had the struggle pertained simply to doctrine, Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley would have soon sunk into impotence and obscurity, with slight results, like Huss, and Jerome, and Wickliffe. The people at large prefer ancient superstitions to religious novelties. They walk in the steps of their fathers with an hereditary faith. They receive the same dogmas. They practice the same ceremonies. They bow to the same idols. They are seldom fitted for theological investigations. But they could understand how annates drained the realm. They could see how the fees and fines of ecclesiastical courts emptied their pockets. They could comprehend how licentious priests corrupted their families; how begging monks impoverished the kingdom; how tyrannical ecclesiastics trampled on their rights. When the strife was between an Italian Pope and an English King, their national spirit was aroused. No contest in regard to transubstantiation, to confession, to purgatory, would have ever terminated in the overthrow of the Roman Supremacy. As the struggle began in the selfish passions of the monarch, so it was carried forward through the selfish interests of the people. Perhaps in no other way could the triumph have been secured. The marvel is not that it was *thus* accomplished, but that it was *ever* accomplished. When we remember how vast, how ancient, how venerable was the papal power; when we remember how it was supported by the thrones of Europe; when we remember how deeply it was rooted in the superstitious love and fear of the people; when we remember how it was guarded by excommunications, anathemas, and interdicts; when we remember how it was sustained by the vows and interests of armies of monks, and priests, and Bishops, we may be willing to admit that possibly nothing but the uxorious passions and inherited courage of Henry; the uncongenial tempers of Catharine; the tempting charms of Anne; the duplicity of Clement; the artifices of Campeggio; the jealousies of Charles; the fears of Francis; the subserviency of Cranmer; the coarseness of Latimer; the pliancy of Parliaments; the corruptions of juries; the venality of courtiers; the inviting treasures of religious houses; the avarice of



ecclesiastics, and a thousand circumstances essentially earthly, were indispensable parts of that mysterious scheme of Providence which finally ejected from England, and thus preserved from our own republic, a spiritual usurpation which would have fettered human freedom, debauched the human intellect, arrested human progress, and the effects of whose perpetuation would have been far more dark and disastrous, than the instruments of its overthrow were mean and despicable. Let the imperfections of the agents be forgotten in the glory of the results.

Nor does the nature of Henry's relation to the Church of England at all affect the question we are now considering. The King's own view of this subject seems not very clear or consistent. In reply to the Convocation of York, he said:—

“As to spiritual things, meaning the Sacraments, being by God ordained as instruments of efficacy and strength, whereby grace is of His infinite goodness conferred upon His people, for as much as they be no wordly and temporal things, they have no wordly or temporal head but only Christ.”

The subsequent suspension of the Bishops, and grant of royal authority even to ordain, would indicate that Henry afterwards advanced his pretensions. But no claim to any headship resembling the papal has ever been acknowledged by the Anglican Church, or asserted by any of his successors. All, however, we have here proposed to investigate is, not the relation of the English King, but the ejection of the Roman Pontiff. This was the question which agitated Europe, and was to affect the world. This was the question between Henry and Clement. This was the question which Dr. Littledale seems wholly to have overlooked. To the Pope and the monarch it was then most absorbing. The tiara was battling against the crown. How vast was the struggle is indicated by the hesitancy of the contestants. The one dreaded to declare a separation as much as the other feared to pronounce an excommunication. They resembled two clouds in the heavens, crossed by lightnings, and growling with thunders, yet pausing before hurling together their black, angry, surcharged masses. At the last, only the seemingly accidental delay of a courier prevented a nominal submission of England to the Papacy, which might have changed the whole course of history. Indeed, for a long period, Clement did not believe Henry in earnest. It was the blood of More and Fisher which startled Europe to a

sense of the terrible reality of the King's purpose, who intended to place between himself and the Pope their stained blocks and ghastly forms as an impassable barrier of separation. Mournful as was their tragic end, and much as we admire their inflexible purpose, their execution was a necessity of Henry's position, and an indispensable scene in a drama of blood eventually to terminate in the emancipation of a realm. As the world appears drifting away from the memory of the past, and English clergymen seem forgetting the nature of their relation to their kingdom and their Church, it may not be amiss to present in a single view some of the measures which terminated the papal domination in Great Britain. We do this more cheerfully since in the Parliament, making the first declaration, were largely educated those gifts, and developed those principles which have since so deeply impressed the nation.

The Act of Supremacy, passed 26 Henry VIII., and which was the consummation of a struggle carried forward during centuries, declares : —

"Be it enacted, by authority of this present Parliament, that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have, and enjoy, annexed, and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof as all the honors, dignities, preëminences, jurisdictions, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities, to the said dignity belonging and appertaining; and that our said Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed, — most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm, — any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."

The oath of allegiance provided, substantially, that any one slanderously and maliciously opposing the Act of Supremacy should be guilty of high treason. This statute, of course, remained during the ghastly reign of Edward — a youth, who, surrounded by doctors, and crammed with theology, wore his crown like an au-

tomaton, and was evidently killed by an unnatural and premature devotion to the affairs of Church and State. A sudden reaction after his death bore Mary enthusiastically to the throne. Pole leaves Brussels in triumph. He enters Calais amid ringing bells and roaring cannon. He crossed the channel beneath a bright sun; and before a gay breeze. He reaches England, now kindled into a blaze of joy. He passes up the Thames to London in a splendid barge, above whose bow was a gleaming silver cross. He is received with ecstasy by Philip, and with kisses by Mary. The city is bright with banners, alive with processions, magnificent with pageants. St. Paul's resounds with a *Te Deum*. The King and Queen, sitting beneath a canopy of state, receive Pole. The Cardinal solemnly exhorts to a repeal of the laws of Henry. The Lords unanimously restore England to the Papacy, while in the Commons a single member stands alone dissenting. Pole, amid a gorgeous and impressive scene, while kneeling before him are representatives of all estates of the realm, with the prostrate majesty of England, pronounces in the deep silence of a hushed assembly the absolution of the nation:—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, which with His most precious blood hath redeemed and washed us from all our sins and iniquities, that He might purchase unto Himself a glorious spouse without spot or wrinkle, whom the Father hath appointed Head over all the Church: He, by His mercy, absolves you, and we, by Apostolic authority given unto us by the most Holy Lord Pope Julius the Third, His vicegerent on earth, do absolve and deliver you, and every of you, with this whole realm, and the dominions thereof, from all heresy and schism, and from all and every judgment, censure, and pain for that cause incurred; and we do restore you again into the unity of our Mother the Holy Church, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Well might the Papacy exult! Well might the guns thunder at St. Angelo! Well might Rome blaze with bonfires, and rejoice in triumph! Well might St. Peter's, from base to dome, flash with brilliance. Soon are swept from the Statute Book all the acts directed against the Roman Supremacy, and apparently the work of Henry is destroyed, and his mission defeated. Annates, dispensations, exactions, appeals, are to come back on the kingdom like a locust-cloud. But no! It was not the purpose of Heaven that this unnatural marriage consummated by Pole and Mary should continue, however Archbishop Manning may desire a pres-

ent declaration of its validity, or Dr. Littledale fail to esteem the repudiation of the Papacy an excellence of the Reformation. Elizabeth was exalted to the throne to finally triumph, as by a special providence, over the foreign coalitions and domestic factions which had threatened to overwhelm her father, and thus to complete and confirm for all time the separation of the realm of England from the sway of Italy. A bill, passed in the first year of her illustrious reign, declared the Crown, "in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme." We do not trace this legislation because we admire the conferred power of an English King, but because it forever abolished from England the usurped power of the Roman Pontiff.

And here we can scarcely refrain from observing that true Churchmen, of all persons, are most opposed in principle to the theories of the Papacy. Sometimes in their instinctive obedience to certain historic sympathies, and their noble desire for Christian unity, the fact is forgotten. Supposing that the temporal claims of the Roman Bishop were forever waived, what are his spiritual pretensions? These will be seen in a recent number of the "Catholic World," not as received in remote antiquity, but as held at the present hour. The writer, in the course of a labored comparison between the body and the Papacy, remarks:—

"This organic cell generates, or produces, not many organisms, but one only. So the Chair of St. Peter, the central cell of the Church organism, can generate only one organism. That only can be the Catholic Church in which is, as its centre, the Chair of St. Peter, or as we have before said, the organic central See, which may be justly called the Holy See, the Apostolic See, the mother and mistress of all churches, as in the living body the original central organic cell is the mother and mistress of all the secondary or inferior cells generated in the evolution of the organism."

The Roman Catholic Church makes the Pope the sole source of spiritual authority. The Reformed Catholic Church makes our Lord Jesus Christ the fountain of power, communicated through the Apostles to their successors for all time. The one binds to him occupying the Chair of St. Peter. The other binds through the links of centuries to Him reigning on the Throne of Heaven. The one points to any present Pope as the centre of its life. The other directs to our eternal Saviour as the sun of its system. The loose Churchman, esteeming a denominational ministry equal

to his own, may here harmonize with this, or with any theory of Rome ; but the strict Churchman, venerating Apostolic Order as the sacred institution of Heaven, is in perpetual antagonism. Both in principle and practice, the barrier between us is now impassable. Neither party can concede what to other seems essential. However we may admire the gorgeous, the venerable, the imposing ceremonial of Rome ; however we may esteem it a Catholic inheritance ; however we may desire to secure by its imitation influence over the masses, we must remember there are questions of Faith and of Order of infinitely more importance than the fragrance of incense, the symbolism of lights, the significance of vestments. To please the eye is less important than to move the heart, or instruct the intellect. With the mere ceremonial of Ritualism, regulated by a proper authority, and representing a correct doctrine, we have a strong personal sympathy. Under these limitations, we could bear not only the dim light of a few candles, but a bright blaze of beams, like a crown of glory over the altar. Should the law ordain, we would be pleased with a cloud of fragrance rising towards heaven as an emblem of Christian gratitude. With such a restriction, there could be no more harm in the varied hue of vestments, than in the changeful garniture of seasons. It seems to us, wherever an innovation may seem of doubtful legality, or expediency, every loyal clergyman will consult his Bishop before daring to introduce what may divide his parish, and disturb the Church. If his appointed ecclesiastical adviser has a doubt in regard to the proper course, nothing should be attempted until the question is clearly settled by some recognized authority. We reverence Catholic usage, but cannot by a mere individual judgment determine it according to our opinions, or our caprice. We dare not gratify taste at the expense of conscience, or of charity. Besides, there is something ignoble in imitation and adulation. When we see certain persons affecting Rome, we are irresistibly reminded of a youthful animal gambolling admiringly around an antiquated lion, who only grows at his advances. They do not exhibit towards Babylon a manly love, but a boyish fondness for her gold and scarlet.

And here we must express our surprise that Dr. Littledale should so highly value the ceremonial abolished by the English Reformation, and so poorly esteem the corruptions it overthrew. He can see the errors of its supporters, but cannot see their vir-

tues. He can perceive the lust, the tyranny, the cruelty of Henry, but cannot perceive that heroic courage of his Tudor blood which in the popular admiration attached "gallant" to his name, enabled him to defy the combinations of Europe, and hurl from his kingdom a domination which was exhausting its resources, and blasting its life. He can describe the vacillation, the cowardice, the turpitude of Cranmer, but has no eulogy for those patient labors which have left an ineffaceable impress on our venerable Liturgy, and which, if darkened by an ignoble recantation, were terminated by a triumphant martyrdom. He can paint the coarseness of Latimer, but has no word of praise for that manly courage which rebuked sin, and defied the flames. He can show Ridley and Hooper in those weaknesses which we acknowledge and regret, but he cannot exhibit them amid the chain, and the fagot, and the fire, dying for their Saviour. He can tell the truth, but not the whole truth. He says what Romanists have asserted a thousand times, in the same words, and with the same spirit, and he says nothing more. We now see too often placed in the foreground of the picture, in bright color, and enlarged form, the virtues of the papal adherents, and in the background of the picture, in dim lines, and diminished size, the merits of the reformers, overshadowed and obscured by their exaggerated faults. Certainly this might be expected from the man who, giving his fathers in the Church only credit for securing the circulation of the Bible, the translation of the Liturgy, and the restoration of the cup, implies a censure for abolishing the Papal Supremacy, transubstantiation, purgatory, the invocation of saints, and a long train of corruptions in doctrine and morals, which, logically, he should seek to reëstablish. And in regard to others of his school, less intense and extreme — men of evident piety — sincere, modest, self-denying, and laborious — to be esteemed both for their tempers and their works — we would say, that however innocent it may be in times of peace to imitate the beautiful devices of an enemy's banner, in times of war the act may be treason to the kingdom, to be expiated only by life.

We will conclude our Article by an allusion to our own country. The usurpations of the Papacy have twice divided Christendom. First they alienated the Greek Church, and afterwards the Anglican. The result was inevitable, from such an unwarrantable and unexampled assumption of power as we have proven from historic



facts and Romish writers. In our own country we see the Papacy in a form modified by our institutions. It hides its arrogant claims from the bright light of liberty. It is seen in gorgeous ceremonies. It is seen in bannered processions. It is seen in imposing edifices. It is seen in flourishing schools. It is seen in immense hospitals. It is seen in multiplied good works, which certainly are commendable, in vast relief to human misery. The whole system, softened and relieved by the genius of freedom, is beheld with diminished faults, and exaggerated virtues. The chief source of its power is its unity in the Pope. This imparts compactness, vigor, consistency, concentration to all its movements. But the same can be affirmed of any absolute power, temporal or spiritual. You can ascribe to the sway of an Alexander, a Cæsar, a Charlemagne, a Nicholas, all the merit you can ascribe to the sway of a Pope. A great central, irresponsible, supreme authority need not take time for consultation, and is not embarrassed by opposing plans. With it, volition and action are identical. But it is unity purchased at the expense of liberty. It is vigor obtained with the sacrifice of security. It is success which is peril. Our own government results from the experience of ages, and is a system of checks and balances on suspected power, so adjusted as to prevent its encroachments without destroying its efficiency. The Papacy may now exult in the successes of its unity; but its present victory intimates its future overthrow. The day approaches, when its imported subjects, liberated from ages of superstitious submission, and taught the habits of freemen, will be disposed to inquire into the history and the reasons of a domination which claims to be supreme and universal. The result is inevitable. Blind subjection will be refused, and without a perfect surrender of the entire man to one human will, the Romish unity is a myth, a shadow, a vanished spectre of the past. What lost the Orient to the Papacy, and severed England from the Papacy, will preserve America from the Papacy. And when the day of reckoning comes, from the clouds of sectarian and Romish aspersion, the REFORMED CATHOLIC CHURCH, true to her Primitive Faith and Order, like the sun in the heavens, will shine the light, the salvation, the glory of our world.

## ART. II. — FAITH AND REASON.

THE relations of Faith to Reason are so complicated and so delicate, that to present a complete view of the nature and offices of the two faculties would be matter for an extended work; the aim of the present paper, therefore, is merely to sketch the outline map of a theory on the subject which shall serve to guide the traveler's course over this difficult ground, and we hope to speak not entirely in vain unless we shall fail entirely in this attempt.

At the outset we shall avoid half the confusion we are liable to fall into if we understand precisely what meaning we attach to the terms we use; it is of less consequence to be philologically accurate in the signification we intend, than it is to know clearly ourselves *what* signification we intend. Faith, then, we will define generally as a persuasion of the truth of anything asserted to the mind, independently of any evidence for it, and even in some cases in spite of the mind's inability to comprehend it. Reason, as the word is popularly understood, is the process which establishes the truth of a proposition by showing its necessary consequence upon another proposition previously ascertained to be true. At first sight it appears that the results of the one process must be far less certain than those of the other; that the former can only be matter of opinion, while the latter are matter of knowledge. But this is a superficial view; for retrace the reasoning process to its beginning, and it is plain that the *first* proposition, by near or remote connection with which all the others are proved to be true, has not itself been established by this process. The structure of demonstration rests upon that which has not been demonstrated, and consequently *demonstration* cannot be the source of certainty. To refuse certainty to what cannot be demonstrated is thus to strike away the foundation of demonstration itself. Herbert Spencer says: "All knowledge is relative because all explanation — *i. e.*, the reducing of a cognition to a more general — must eventually bring us down to the inexplicable." But if, as he maintains, the inexplicable is the unknowable, the proper conclusion is rather that no knowledge is possible than that all knowledge is relative. If all knowledge is relative, the knowledge of this fact is also relative, and it does not appear how such a relative knowledge, based on that which cannot be known, can be properly called knowledge at

all. But let us turn round this statement that "all explanation will bring us down to the inexplicable," and look at its other side : (1) If to explain a notion is to reduce it to a more general one, the alternate inexplicable is the alternate genus, *i. e.*, the universal ; (2) but the more general the more simple (as Logic has it, the greater the Extension, the less the Comprehension), and the alternate genus is the purely simple ; (3) but the simpler the more clearly known, therefore the purely simple (or inexplicable) is the perfectly clearly known. Hence Intuition or Contemplation (German, *Anschauung*) is the primordial faculty, and the source of our knowledge. The mind recognizes Truth because it is constituted to do so ; and to say that human ignorance and error are evidence of its natural incapacity, is much like saying that feebleness of sight is an effect of being blind from one's birth.

But although there may be nothing magical in demonstration, and although we admit that the source of certainty for both Reason and Faith is nothing but the spontaneous activity of the mind, yet do not the results of these two mental processes differ widely in certainty ? To comprehend is surely a different thing from believing. Will not Faith, which accepts less evidence than reason demands, or even none at all, go astray much the sooner ? We answer, not necessarily. For we must remember that to reason correctly is not an easy thing, but a very difficult thing ; reasoning, even for masters of the art, is by no means a perfectly sure process ; that which one man seems to establish conclusively, another will show to be fallacious. Again, if Faith is satisfied with less evidence than Reason, it is on this account, that it is mainly influenced by antecedent presumptions ; so that Faith seems to approach nearly to a rapid and condensed mode of reasoning — a reasoning *enthymematically*, or from suppressed premises. Now when our prepossessions are groundless, our assumptions invalid, our notions mistaken, our faith may properly be called irrational, and will probably lead us into error ; but when all these are unexceptionable, then we are justified in believing upon slender evidence. Here the language and conduct of the Apostles throw light upon our way. Faith, as the word is used by the New Testament writers, signifies chiefly a certain moral temper of mind ; a submission or quiescence of the reasoning faculty, and an inclination, even an eagerness to believe. This was the regeneration of heart — the spiritual new birth. And this was the starting-point. Until this religious spirit had mani-

festated itself the hearer of the word had not taken the first step towards conversion. The Apostle might labor to inspire or evoke it, but in doing so he looked upon himself as a mere instrument; Faith was a gift of grace — the “natural man beheld not the things of the Spirit of God.” A painful sense of sin, a feeling of helplessness, a yearning towards an infinite Father and Friend, a glow of humility, reverence, and love — such things as these, made up the change of heart in which Faith had its being. A very little, therefore, was sufficient to admit one into the company of the faithful. He was not required to believe, he was expressly required to “have Faith to believe.” That earnest cry, “Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief,” was an exact expression of Faith in the Gospel sense. We may discriminate then between Faith and Belief. The essence of Faith is *not* to believe, but earnestly to wish and strive to believe. The latter springs from the former as the plant springs from the germ. There is already a certain rational activity in Faith, for with the laying down of arms by the reasoning faculty is combined a reaching forth toward Truth — an endeavor to apprehend; but Belief is *entirely* a rational activity; it is the apprehension which Faith aspires to — it is conviction. It may be more or less well-grounded, it may be utterly erroneous, but it is never anything else than the simplest exercise of Reason, taking that word now in its extended use as signifying the intellectual principle of our nature. The essential in Belief is not its truth or falsity, but its sincerity. To be properly a belief it must be a free personal conviction, not an opinion adopted from others; it must be possessed, not merely embraced. This distinguishes it from superstition, a *standing upon* a platform of doctrine, a hanging up of one’s belief on the peg of authority, a saying we believe without caring that such an assertion is in fact empty and unmeaning. It shows strikingly how extremes meet, to find nearly the same language in the mouths of infidels who arrogate the name of rationalists, and in the mouth of so unquestionably a devout and earnest Christian as the late F. W. Robertson. The one refuse to believe what cannot be comprehended; the other says that that cannot be belief which does not understand what it asserts. With the former this language comes from contempt of Faith; with the latter from insistence upon the importance of a Faith more real and living than he saw about him. There is indeed too much tendency to rest in a conventional dogmatism. How shall lip-service of the head be more acceptable

than lip-service of the heart? Piety is incumbent upon the intellect as well as upon the affections. "My duty towards God is to believe in Him," says our Catechism, putting this duty before those of reverence and love. Now the earnestness with which we believe may be our safeguard against error. If Belief is a serious thing for us, if it is the work of our own minds, it will be guided by the love of Truth which is natural to our minds, and we shall not easily be blown about by every vain wind of doctrine.

We should distinguish two kinds of Belief; one which springs from the individual bias of our minds, from past education and habits of feeling. This is to some degree voluntary; it is called confidence; in excess, credulity, and its absence, suspicion or distrust. It has to deal with probabilities, and since it is the very nature of probabilities to have no definite ascertained value, what are such to each individual depends upon his individual cast of mind. The other kind of Belief is one which is common to the human mind, which depends upon its nature and constitution, and which the will cannot affect. It deals with realities, and it simply recognizes them. Neither activity has any affinity to Reasoning, which works to the comprehension of relations, nor is the subject-matter of either akin to that of reasoning. Probabilities have no *necessary* connection, hence they cannot be reasoned about and reduced to certainty; while self-evident truths are self-related, and thus are unsusceptible of demonstration because they go back of reasoning, and form its postulates and data.

This second kind of Belief, which we spoke of above as Intuition, we may call Knowledge, if we agree that it is a perception of Truth. To argue this point thoroughly would be to enter into a refutation of the profound Kantian skepticism. We can only say here that such a refutation is possible — and in substance already exists in the later German philosophy — and pass on to some considerations that may satisfy the ordinary view. That Intuition is a perception of Truth appears from the fact that the individuality in no way intermeddles with it. The expression "individual reason," which appears in the declamations of some upholders of authority, is a blundering one; there is nothing less individual than reason. Individuality is the freedom in us; the will is free to move the muscular system, it is not free to change a mathematical conception. Not only does the human mind believe, *e. g.*, in what it calls Duty, but it cannot help believing so. A man may disobey and

blunt his conscience, but, till he ceases to be a *man*, he cannot bring himself to believe in the indifference of right and wrong. If the primary conceptions of reason were individual in character, if they were opinions, and not truths — we should not impose them, as now we do, upon others ; we should not call those insane who differ with us as to mathematical axioms, or the distinction between right and wrong. Thus reason appears to be something absolute, to be the law of all individuals. Convictions so universal, so positive, so invariable, seem to require nothing beside themselves to guarantee their certainty ; and at all events it is plain, that if there is no certainty here, at the fountain-head of the mind's being, there is none anywhere for man. Readers of Cousin will remember how eloquently he enlarges upon the character and the sphere of the intuitional reason. Intuition, he says, is necessarily free from any doubt, because it is anterior to reflection ; it does not belong to us, it comes of itself ; it is an activity, no doubt, but not a personal activity. He calls it inspiration, considers it equivalent to a revelation of truth, and as such the ground of natural religion. "In the infancy of civilization he who possesses the gift of inspiration in a higher degree than his fellows, passes for the confidant and interpreter of God, and in fact he is so in a profoundly philosophic sense ; hence the origin of prophecies and priesthoods. Again when man, hurried away by the rapid and vivid perception of truth, tries to express in words what passes within him, he can only do so in phrase as elevated as the ideas he seeks to convey. The natural language of inspiration is Poetry. Mankind does not begin with prose, but with Poetry, because it begins not with reflection but with intuition ; not with Science but with Faith." . . . "No man thinks but puts faith in his thought, and if he has Faith in his thought he puts Faith in the principle of thought, and this principle, whether he know it or not, is God. Every serious conviction rests on a hidden Faith in thought, in reason, in God. Every utterance is an act of Faith ; every primitive conception a religious movement of the soul. Search the earliest records of a language, and you will find nothing anterior to hymns and litanies. The state of mind before reflection comes is a state of innocence, the golden age of thought." Inspiration, quickened and exalted, becomes Enthusiasm, whose etymology, *θεός ἐν ἡμῖν*, shows it to be the source of whatever is most noble in human action. What we call Genius, also, is a spontaneous activity akin to Faith, though rather



productive than apprehensive ; its etymology, *genus*, declares that it is the working of a power common and fundamental to the mind of the race.

Considerations like these are certainly striking and suggestive, but, while raising it to a high place, we should be on our guard against attributing to the intuitional faculty an exaggerated importance. It is true that an excess of the reasoning spirit will bring one under the tyranny of Logic, which, like many things, is an excellent servant but a dangerous master ; the mind will become mechanical, lose its vital power, and soon deny what it cannot demonstrate. The sphere of reasoning is the Negative, because it is a thinking by means of media ; so that it is not a rhetorical flourish to say that the reasoning spirit is the spirit of atheism. "We have the mind of Christ," says St. Paul, speaking of those who lived by Faith ; and the Understanding, cut from faith and love, is no less truly the mind of devils ; as is shown us in *Faust*, for the real Mephistophiles is within Faust, and within every human soul.

But if this is the case with reasoning, it is likewise true that an excessive spirit of faith will lead us from believing what cannot be demonstrated, to believing what can be demonstrated to be false ; it will nourish an inclination for vain theorizing ; lift us from the firm footing of common sense, and offer us shadows for our embracing, till finally we lose ourselves in mysticism. We are only safe when both activities are justly balanced. Reason cannot get on without belief, Faith cannot suffice for itself without reflection.

Intuition is the elementary activity of mind ; it is not the only healthy one, nor the highest one. It is knowledge, but it is not scientific knowledge, any more than the acorn is the oak. Knowledge is only complete when belief and comprehension are united. Immediate knowing must pass through the stage of mediation and arrive at absolute mediation, that ultimate point where analysis turns round and becomes synthesis. The complete development of mental activity is Speculation, the thinking of pure reason. The field upon which Speculation is employed is the Universal, the same as that of Faith, but it does not merely apprehend reality, it comprehends it as well ; it not only knows, but it knows the how and why of the thing. The speculative process is by means of the Dialectic to ascend to the highest principle and establish its validity, instead of descending by means of Deduction, from first

principles assumed to be valid; and then, having gained this vantage-ground, it finds its way out of the quarrelsome antinomies of the understanding into the organic unity which underlies them. It comes to use concrete principles instead of abstract ones, and so to think by wholes. For it discovers that logical "laws of thought" are only half-laws, fragments of principles; it reconciles the conflicting principles of Identity and of Distinction in a harmony which completes each by the other; and then it goes on to discover the constitution of the positive out of the negative, to take into its hands the keys of all wonders, and to read the "open secret" of the universe. Truth can be known by the thinking Reason. Less than this is incompatible with the nature of spirit, and a doctrine which denies this is an indignity to God and to man. Nor is such a knowledge vague and uncertain as those ignorant of it pretend, but on the contrary a knowledge the most full, the most precise, and the most certain; "musical as is Apollo's lute" to all whose ears are attuned to its harmony. But when we say that this knowledge is possible, we would by no means affirm that it is easy of attainment. To ascend to the speculative insight one must labor to elevate his thinking as only spirit can labor, and the full power and enlightened vision can come only by a change in one's innermost, by a new birth of the intellect, as complete as the regeneration of heart which Religion demands. Such a philosophical Faith is what St. Paul speaks of under the name of Wisdom. He came to the Corinthians, "not with excellency of speech or of wisdom," but, as we said, in the attempt to stir their hearts to Faith, because this was the way to *begin*; "Howbeit," he adds, "we speak wisdom among them that are perfect." . . . "For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." . . . "He that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man." Now if it be a fact — and no one can doubt that it is — that the present age is one of intense intellectual activity and rapid intellectual advancement, then it becomes of great consequence that the guiding spirit of the age should be "a right judgment in all things." But, whether or not the next generation of scientific thinkers shall be able to work themselves into a speculative stage, the present tendency of thought is such as to inspire some alarm for the future. The development of mind is not entirely harmonious, and therefore not entirely complete. The understanding is getting educated out of proportion to the soul. The knowledge that comes from sense —

perception and reasoning, or "Positive" knowledge, is the only thought worthy of the name. The astonishing progress of the physical sciences during the last twenty years, has been mainly influential in bringing about this result. A great army of students have carried their researches profoundly into every department of physics; have penetrated into Nature's laboratories and discovered her secret workings. This stripping off the veil from Isis has left nothing for our wonder, and while removing ignorance, has in great part destroyed reverence. Engaged in the sphere of the related, these men cannot rise above the conception of secondary causation, and the "Correlation of Forces" is complacently announced as the ultimate *aperçu* of modern science. They do not take the Necessary and discard the Real, as did the infidel scientists of the last century, but they take the Necessary to be the Real, and preach to us a new Pantheism whose deities are Matter and Force, dismissing the Personality of God — the highest of all Ideas, and the greatest of all truths — as an anthropomorphic illusion belonging to times of unenlightened credulity.

The current of the prevailing philosophy runs strongly in sympathy with that of natural science. Mere logicians set themselves up for doctors in metaphysic, and that which they cannot logically comprehend they deny that the mind can know, though some of them will allow it a *belief* in the Absolute, which on their own showing is only a mockery or a palpable superstition. With such a languishing of Philosophy and Religion, as must come when the intuitional faculty is inactive, Art naturally sympathizes. Its two most eminent English critics — Mr. Ruskin and Sir F. Palgrave — have written its death-warrant in distinctly asserting that its end and aim is pleasure, a high and refined pleasure indeed, but only a pleasure and nothing more. This theory, which is precisely analogous to that Epicureanism which makes the end of virtue to consist in its advantageous results to the well-doer, accords with the general attitude of opinion resulting from the predominance of the understanding. We have said it is essential to this faculty to view things in relation. The highest result of comprehension is the view of "negative unity;" in this view it is seen that no thing exists in isolation, for the very properties of each thing are its relations to other things, and these properties, the distinctive characteristics of the thing, are the destruction of its independence, for they bind it up with other things. Thus all is reduced to dependence and fini-

tude; there is nothing for itself, but each thing *is* through others. But consider that this carefully linked chain must be fastened somewhere to support anything. You may add dependents to dependents as you add ciphers to ciphers, but the result will be a dependent still, and a dependent *implies* an independent, that is, a self-dependent; the Relative and Finite presuppose the Infinite and Absolute, without which they could not exist themselves.

The only way to counteract the dangerous tendency of the modern scientific spirit is to meet it fairly and carry it up to higher ground. The "golden age of thought" is gone by. Humanity cannot return to its childhood any more than the individual can. Knowledge and thought are coming down into the masses, and the number of those who can get on with a purely emotional Religion getting fewer every day. The Church must "be of its time," as the French say, if it would maintain its influence, and would not see the civilization of the future shaped by irreligious agencies. St. Paul says; "Let a man so account of us as stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover, it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful." Let the Church, then, elevate itself to a philosophic vantage-ground, as the time demands, and let Faith join hands with Reason, its natural ally. For we insist upon the truth that all genuine speculative systems are profoundly theistic in spirit. It is only a sham philosophy that sets itself in opposition to a true Religion, and such a one conflicts no less with true philosophy. To deny the existence of the Absolute, or the possibility of knowledge of it, is to strike at the foundations of Philosophy and of Religion with the same blow. This is the gist of all controversy. Is the Infinite the positive and abiding existence, and the Finite the negative and transitory; are the laws of mind the laws of being also, — since that only is being which *is* for itself, the self-related spirit — so that the intuitions of faith are apprehensions of reality; is there an Absolute Being, the Creator and Preserver of the universe, the Father of the human race, who has made us to believe in Him, to fear Him, and to love Him? Faith answers that all this is true; Reason adds that it *must* be true.

## ART. III. — JOHN COLET, DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

THE death of Dean Milman naturally sends one's thoughts back along the line of his predecessors in office. What a line it is! specially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. What labors for good learning, what work for Christ, nay, what histories even, does it suggest! Sherlock, Stillingfleet, Sancroft, Donne, Overal, Nowell, Colet. Such names are not precisely suggestive of that "mild repose" which a late writer seems to consider the principal characteristic of a deanery.

But, in truth, the scholarship of England, theological and general, owes a debt to Cathedral stalls and College fellowships that cannot be overestimated. There was published in 1840 — it lies before us as we write — a volume containing the names "of upwards of two thousand authors, who have, from the Reformation to the present time, enjoyed prebendal or other non-cure endowments of the Church in England." It was a noble list, but large as it was it was very incomplete. One looks at it now with feelings of mingled pride and sadness. Is all this indeed a thing of the past? Is the line not to be continued? Report declares that the late Dean of St. Paul's once said, "I am the last learned man in the Church;" not an over-modest speech certainly, nor, we may be thankful, exactly true. There is, however, some truth in what follows: "Good parish priests, good men of business, with a fair knowledge of books and men, these there will be plenty of; no sinecurists; hard working pastors, but not learned; indeed, there is hardly room for the article." There is a craze about what is called work just now, and work is a good thing assuredly. But is learning a bad one? When we add to this tendency the general upsetting of everything in the mother country which seems inevitably coming to universities as well as Church, the look-out for the future is not over-cheering to those who desiderate, if not a learned clergy, at least a learned class among them. But we beg pardon for this digression. We intended merely to protest against the vulgar notion embodied in the line —

"To rest the cushion and soft down invite,"

and we have been led on to remarks which are too likely to be greeted with the exclamation, "Doth he not speak parables?"

Among all the Deans of London's Cathedral Church, not one

deserves more honorable mention than Dr. John Colet. Learned amid unlearned men, godly amid dissolute ones, beneficent when avarice prevailed, spiritual when so many were secularized, holding fast to truth when such numbers perverted it, he stands in the front rank of our English reformers before the Reformation. And it is thus that we propose chiefly to speak of him. Mere biographical details are soon despatched, though they may not be entirely omitted.

He was born in London — and Erasmus says it was then accounted *nonnulla nobilitatis pars* to be so born — in 1466, and went to Oxford about 1483. In one respect that period resembled this. Men went to the universities and entered on the work of life at an early age. It is quite in accordance, too, with the indecent practices which prevailed before our Reformation, that we find him at the age of nineteen, while he was yet an acolyte, or at most sub-deacon, instituted into the valuable living of St. Mary's, Denington, in the Diocese of Norwich. The worst of the affair is that nobody seems to have suspected anything wrong in it. To what mind Colet finally came, we shall see by and by. In 1493 he left Oxford and travelled abroad four years, "in order to improve himself more completely in the circuits of learning and the knowledge of the world." Returning in 1497, he was ordained Deacon and Priest, and established himself at Oxford, "for the happy opportunities of a studious and pious life."

From this retirement, in which it has been well said "he was not buried but let his light shine," he was withdrawn by Henry VII., who, in 1505 promoted him to the deanery of St. Paul's. The eminent services of his father, who as Lord Mayor of London had won the royal regard for his loyalty, prudence, and generosity, may have had something to do with this advancement, but it was mainly due to his own great merits and spotless character. He held his deanery for fourteen years, and died in September, 1519, at the early age of forty-three.

And now we pass from these few, but sufficient biographical data, to speak of Dean Colet as one of the chief among the pre-Reformation reformers. A few words must be allowed us by way of preface.

There is a chapter in the history of movements towards a reformation before the reign of Henry VIII., that is yet to be written. Papal encroachments on the civil power, and the resist-



ance to them, the history of *Provisors* and *Præmunire*, Wickliffe's labors and his followers' excesses — these, and many things besides, have been pretty thoroughly discussed. But the providentially ordered preparations made by quiet Christian scholars, who promoted the study of the sacred tongues, lectured on the Holy Scriptures instead of sentences from the schoolmen, preached Christ's Gospel instead of man's traditions, taught His merits in place of those of men, revived patristic studies, attacked scholastic subtleties, denounced the vices and shameful sloth into which the monastic orders had sunk, and moved altogether on a higher level than that which a thoroughly corrupted Church presented; the labors of such men as William Grocyne, Thomas Linacre, William Lilly, Thomas More, and John Colet, — these wait some master's touch to arrange and bring before us their noble history. When this is done, — may it be not long delayed, — then we shall see what that condition of our mother Church was to which some of her children seem to wish to bring her back; we shall learn that our Anglican Reformation was rooted elsewhere than in parliaments and courts, and find in what company they would have stood then who to-day scorn and flout it.

A very principal place, as we have said, among these sometimes unconscious, but not the less real workers for our Reformation, was held by the Dean of St. Paul's. So fully was this recognized in Mary's reign, that we are told by Bale, that "had there not been weighty matters in the way," his body, like that of Wickliffe, would have been "taken up and burned." The scent of Mary's inquisitors was usually correct. They fulfilled at least one half of the old saying, *Vinum et hæresim è longinquò odorat*.

No less a pen than that of Erasmus has given us an account of Colet's undergraduate and earlier studies; how he had read the works of Cicero and done something with Plato and Plotinus; studied all parts of mathematics and searched into the ancients, especially Dionysius, Origen, Ambrose, Cyprian, and Jerome; how he was repelled from Augustine, and cared little for Scotus and Thomas; how he consulted the best treatises of civil as well as canon law, studied the historians and lawyers of his native land, and polished his language and style by reading the English Poets. All Greek writers he must have read in translations, for Greek he mainly acquired during his three years' residence abroad. This is certainly a wide range for that day of cramped and cramping study,

in which time and brains were worn and wasted to such little purpose.

His real work for good learning, however, was done after he came back from his sojourn on the Continent, and, resisting all the allurements of the city and the court, had established himself at Oxford. Several points come, naturally, under review.

And first, if not in importance at least in place, comes the study of Greek. It was not only nearly unattempted in those days, but it was looked on with great suspicion. There was a tang and odor of heresy about it. *Græculus iste* was considered, no doubt, a most sharp reproach when it was hurled at Erasmus. At St. Mary's in Oxford, and at court, in the earlier years of Henry VIII., the study of Greek was denounced and railed against; the court preacher, on one occasion, excusing himself on the rather puritanical ground that he spoke "by the impulse of the Spirit." Puritanism and Popery have, however, a good deal more than this in common. Another illustrative anecdote may not be out of place. "Though the knowledge of the Greek tongue was at this time very low, yet there was a comment on Aristotle ventured on for the sake of the schoolmen, wherein (as ill luck would have it) by the mistake or rather ignorance of the commentator, instead of *ψυχὴ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος*, *anima est immaterialis*, was read *ψυχὴ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος*, *anima est tibia*. This put the good man's brains, while reading upon that author, on the tenters to clear his text; but at last he thought he had done notably, when he brought no less than fifteen reasons, such as they were, to prove that the soul was a pipe."<sup>1</sup> In fact, Romanism has never loved Greek over well. Its dangers are not confined to the sacred books alone, but reach to the Greek Fathers, the true text of which it is not always edifying to contrast with the Latin version. So lately as 1845, the study of Greek in the university schools of France, and the preference given to it was objected against by the then Bishop of Langres; and a distinguished editor in the Abbè Migne's series of the Fathers, told the present Bishop of Lincoln that of the Greek Fathers in that series, he thought "a Latin translation alone would be published."

<sup>1</sup> Knight's *Life of Colet*, p. 51. Nor was Latin learning in a much better state then or afterwards. Erasmus says, on Colet's authority, that a sapient divine argued in convocation in favor of putting heretics to death, from Tit. iii. 10. *Hæreticum . . . devita*; supposing that *devita* meant *de vitâ tollere*, i. e., to take out of life. And Melancthon tells of a divinity professor who, lecturing on the text, *Rex Salem panem et vinum obtulit*, and not knowing his sacred geography, but giving Salem quite another meaning, discoursed learnedly to his auditory in a long disquisition on the nature of salt!

Is it too much to say that not only did Greek learning go hand in hand with our Reformation, but that it does this day, and ever must retain the same relation to Romish errors and corruptions which it held then? Let it be neglected—is it not in danger now?—and men will be left to the mercy of translations which may be garbled and falsified without let or hindrance; nay, they may even sink to the abysmal depths of those six-penny pamphlets which fledgelings in theology, all innocent of Greek, read with gaping wonderment, and then fancy themselves the admirable Crichtons of divinity, and wiser than all teachers.

But Greek takes men to the New Testament, and thither we find it taking Colet. Almost as soon as he had established himself, after his European sojourn, at Oxford, he began to read lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul. This, at the latest, must have been shortly after 1497; and nearly at the same time a similar course of lectures began at Cambridge.

We can hardly estimate now, without pausing to reflect on it, how much the simple statement that in 1498 one scholar was lecturing on the Pauline Epistles at Oxford, and another at Cambridge, means. It means that a text was taken from God's word, and not from Peter Lombard, Scotus, or even Aquinas. It means that "not the voice of scholastic interpreters, and what they called logic," furnished the line of argument, but Scripture itself and primitive antiquity with it. It means that whereas at that day, the degree of Bachelor in Divinity admitted a man only to the reading of the Master of the Sentences, and even the degree of Doctor did not admit to the reading of the Scriptures, a better day was beginning. It means all this and even more.

But, after all, there was no licentiousness of resistance to all authority in Colet's plans. He did not swing away from all moorings into untried waters. Here, in brief, is the statement of his purposes. "He freely expressed his great dislike of that *new theology*, which was unhappily brought into the Church by the [then] modern schoolmen, . . . and would, if possible, restore the theological studies *that were founded upon the Scriptures and the primitive Fathers*." And he gives this as the reason why he had undertaken his lectures on St. Paul at Oxford. Is there not something in these words that reaches on to the ground principle of our Anglican Reformation, Holy Scripture and Primitive Antiquity? Do they not bring to us Cranmer's "Holy Scripture and Ancient

Authors," Ridley's Vincentian rule, Jewel's challenge at St. Paul's Cross, the Canon of 1571? Nay, do they not also carry our thoughts on to a far later period, when another form of scholasticism, imported from Geneva, having overrun the universities and infected the Church, William Laud set himself to restore that better style of theology which was the true birthright of the Anglican Church, and of which Colet was a forerunner?

There is extant a letter written by him to the Abbot of Wynchcomb, from which we venture to make an extract. It is charming for its simplicity, and for its little quiet picture of academic life by a winter fireside, made brighter by what Johnson called "good talk:" —

"There was with me last evening, reverend Father, a fellow priest, a good and learned man, a diligent hearer, moreover, of Paul, and one most desirous of knowing him thoroughly. After we had chatted for a while beside the hearthstone and the fire, he drew from his bosom a copy of Paul's Epistles, written out with his own hand. Smiling, and at the same time praising him, I said, *Ubi thesaurus tuus, ibi cor tuus*. To which he answered, 'Among all that is written I love and admire nothing more than the words of Paul.'"

And then he goes on to tell how, after many other words, they undertook, "sitting by the winter's fire," to note down "what golden sentences" of truth they could gather from the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. He writes them out for the Abbot, adds others that occur to him as he writes, and then says, "Paul seems indeed to me a boundless sea of wisdom and of piety." Verily there was stuff in Oxford that gave hope for the future, when such communings were held in scholars' cells.

One striking saying in reference to the interpretation of the Scriptures, will not be out of place in this connection. He had been combating a notion, held by many and defended by Erasmus, "that the Holy Scriptures were so full and abounding that they might contain several senses in the same words and expressions." "Not," he says, "that I deny the fullness of the Scriptures, no, I admire the exuberant fertility and plenitude of them. But I think it becomes a fruitful womb to have its birth of one kind, full and perfect: not of various kinds, loose and indeterminate in the nature of them." Without denying typical significances, and what Lord Bacon calls the "germinant character" of prophecies, we may

well admit this statement as a remarkable anticipation of a true and healthy exegesis.

From his quiet life at Oxford, Colet was called, as we have said, in 1505, to the deanery of St. Paul's. And here we will speak first of his labors for good learning, and then turn to his more immediate ecclesiastical relations.

His great educational work was the establishment of St. Paul's School, an institution which still remains, "bearing more fruit in its old age," after three centuries of service. It has often been observed that the founding of grammar schools all over England, helped on the coming Reformation. It is stated that "within thirty years before it there were more grammar schools erected and endowed in England, than had been in three hundred years preceding. And after the Reformation was established, the piety and charity of Protestants ran so fast in this channel, that in the next age there wanted rather a regulation of grammar schools than an increase of them. "Surely, the creation of such nurseries of learning, and the founding of colleges, are as worthy acts of charity as the establishing chantries and the endowing of perpetual masses, things which seem to have been the fashion just then. No man can justify the sacrilegious perversion of Church property which state authorities made at the Reformation; and which, as we may see to-day in Italy and Spain, will always sooner or later fall on a Church that has been "proud and full of head." But not all that was done with the Church's property was of this character; and for what was, the Reformation was no further responsible than as affording an opportunity for doing wrong as well as right. Life always affords such opportunities: nor is it anything in favor of stagnation and death that they do not. Wharton's lines at Vale Royal contain a very real truth in, at least, this stanza: —

"From these deserted domes new glories rise,  
More useful institutes adorning man,  
Manners enlarged and new civilities,  
On fresh foundations build the social plan."

Small thanks Dean Colet received in some quarters for this "venture of faith" — it cost him from his own estates some five thousand pounds sterling — in the cause of good learning. Such institutions cannot, in any time, be established without touching some imagined rights of prescription, or some petty personal dignities, and then comes an outcry, or, more frequently, perhaps, an

undercurrent of misrepresentation and abuse. The comfort is, that unless in times when people get burned as heretics, nobody suffers any lasting injury.

Several things are worthy of special remark in relation to the school. It was placed under the patronage of the Child Jesus, and dedicated to him. In the *proscholium* was placed an Iambic ode declaring this, from the pen of Erasmus. It began:—

"Non invenusto antiquitas ænigmate  
 Studii magistram, virginem  
 Finxit Minervam; ac litterarum præses  
 Finxit Camoenas origines;  
 Hunc, Ipse Virgo matre natus virgine  
 Præsideo virgineo gregi;  
 Et Sospitator hujus et Custos scholæ."

At the upper end of the school, and over the master's chair, was an image of the Child Jesus with this distich underneath:—

"Discite me primum, pueri, atque effingite parvis  
 Moribus; inde pias addite literalas."

Carrying out this beautiful and pious idea of dedication and patronage, so strikingly proving the pure faith of the founder, there was appended to the Dean's "Institution of a Christian Man" in English,<sup>1</sup> this prayer in Latin. We would it might be used by Christian students now:—"—

"Most sweet Lord Jesus, who while yet a boy at the age of twelve years, didst so dispute with the doctors in the temple, at Jerusalem, that they were all astonished at Thy most excellent wisdom, I beseech Thee that in this school over which Thou dost preside as its patron, I may daily acquire that learning and wisdom, by which, before all things I may know Thee, O Jesu, who Thyself art my wisdom, and knowing Thee may worship Thee, and follow Thee, and in this short life so walk in the way of Thy doctrine, treading ever in Thy footsteps, that when I depart this life I may, by Thy grace, joyfully attain to some part of that glory to which Thou hast gone before. Amen."

With all this fully agree the noble words of the statute entitled "What shall be taught:—"—

"I would they were taught alwayes in good Literature, bothe Latene and Greke, and good autors such as have the verrye Romayne eloquence joyned with wisdom, specially Cristen autors, that wrote their wisdom with clene and chaste Latene other in verse or in prose, for my intent is by this scole specially to increase knowlege and worshippinge of God

<sup>1</sup> This Institution contains next to nothing of distinctly Romish teaching.



and our Lord Christ Jesu, and good Cristen life and maners in the children."

Indeed it had been said, that, with the exception of an order that the pupils should attend the boy-bishop's sermon in St. Paul's, and make an offering to him, there was nothing in these statutes, which Colet drew up for his School, that the Reformation needed to change. And this is a fact not without significance.

We turn to say a few words of this truly great man, as Dean of St. Paul's. Says Erasmus: —

"This excellent man, as though called to labor not to dignity, restored the decayed discipline of the capitular body, and — what was a new thing — began to preach in his own church on all festivals. . . . He did not take a theme at hand from the Gospel or the apostolical Epistles, but proposed some one topic which he followed out in successive discourses to its end; as, for instance, St. Matthew's Gospel, or the Creed, or the Lord's Prayer."

He associated different persons with him in this good work. In the abundance of preaching in our day, the over-abundance it seems to us, we can hardly estimate all this at its real value. But to recall men to the "true Evangel," when so many sermons were mere scholastic questions scholastically discussed, was a work of the last importance and the truest worth.

In his private opinions, as they are gathered from his own words and the testimony of those who knew him best, he was altogether, though temperately and with judgment, a reformer after the Anglican model. The unclean abuses of too many monasteries he strongly denounced, saying, — what Mr. Ffoulkes has just now said, — that "he never found purer manners than among the married." He denounced, also, the image worship of the day, condemned excessive and "anxiously repeated" auricular confession, contented himself with mass on Sundays and festival days, and illustrated all that he held and taught in the habit of his life.

There is extant a sermon of his preached in 1511, in St. Paul's, before the Convocation. It is an earnest, outspoken cry for reformation, reminding one of the passionate exclamation of St. Roman, the last of the Fathers: "Who will grant me, before I die, to see the Church of God such as she was in the primitive times?" For, indeed, though Rome likes now to say that the desire of reformation was a fanatical outburst of a few disorderly

spirits of the sixteenth century, nothing is more untrue. The Council of Pisa, in 1409, was called in answer to this very cry for a reformation of the Church "in head and members;" the preachers at Constance speak of abuses and corruptions with an emphasis and boldness which Luther has hardly surpassed, and the Conciliar Committee on reform, — the Reformation College as it was called, — testifies to the deeply felt necessity of a purification of the Church; nor is Basle behindhand in these demands. We need nothing more to prove against Romish sneers, the necessity of a reformation, than the words of divines who lived and died in the communion of national Churches which were themselves still in communion with the Roman See. Of these Dean Colet is one, and his sermon before convocation adds its voice to the general demand.

The sermon touches on matters of practice rather than on points of doctrine. Naturally so. Wrong doing is the first wrong with which one comes in contact. But it connects itself, by an inevitable law, with wrong doctrine, or doctrine wrongly held. It was a shallow pretense of a great mind, when Bossuet<sup>1</sup> argued, that because practical evils were what those who early desired a reformation dwelt on, therefore doctrines, and especially the Papacy, would never have been reached by them. They must have been. The final issue could not have been avoided. He must have a strange idea of the connection between truth and life who will insist that it could.

All this could not, of course, go on without subjecting Colet to suspicion, and suspicion easily develops into hatred when a comparison of the daily life of the suspected party with the lives of his accusers tells in his favor. His busiest enemy was Fitz-James, Bishop of London, a narrow minded prelate and a rabid Scotist, who delated him to Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, in three articles of accusation: first, that he had taught that images were not to be worshipped; secondly, that he denied that the words *Feed my sheep* related at all to hospitality, and so had preached against the temporal possessions of Bishops; and thirdly, that he had inveighed against the practice of *reading* sermons, — "preaching from paper" he called it,<sup>2</sup> — and this the poor Bishop thought

<sup>1</sup> *Variations of Protestants*, Book I. c. 2, 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Erasmus had the account of all this from Colet himself. Speaking of reading sermons, he adds in a parenthesis "id quod multi frigide faciunt in Angliâ." It is proper to add that some doubt exists whether Colet's case came before the Archbishop directly or by appeal. The question does not, obviously, affect the main and important facts.

was an especial insult to himself. An attempt was made to incense the King against him, and he was charged besides with having shown kindness to reputed heretics. There was certainly abundant opportunity, at this period, for so doing. For not long after the date of Colet's troubles, Andrew Ammonius, writing to Erasmus, says that the price of wood in London had been raised by the burning of heretics, who increase daily. Even if this be only a ghastly jest, its testimony is important and conclusive.

Archbishop Warham, however, was too wise and true hearted a man to listen to the maunderings of his brother of London, and Colet came off clear. Still the danger he had incurred was not small. Tyndale, Fox, and Archbishop Parker all speak of it. And Latimer says distinctly that "he should have been burnt had not God turned the King's heart to the contrary."

And now, omitting much that one would like to speak of, we reach this good man's death in 1519. His will is remarkable for its provisions. Instead of commending his soul to the Virgin and the Saints as well as to God, he commends it "to God and to our Lord Jesus Christ;" instead of the customary provisions for a funeral, he leaves all to the "discretion of his executors;" he founds no charities, gives no money for "diriges, month's-minds, and anniversary obits, besides the soul-sceal, and oblations to many altars." He died as he had lived, a pre-Reformation reformer.

But how, it may be asked, how comes it to pass that such a man as Colet could live and die in the Roman Church? His is not an isolated case, — there were many, very many others who stood where he did. How could they do this, denying Romish doctrine and still continuing in the communion of the Roman Church? The answer is a very simple one. There was no Roman Church as there is to-day; there was no Roman doctrine as such, till the close of the Council of Trent in 1563, or, if one pleases, till its confirmation in 1564. There were national Churches, as in England, France, Spain, Germany, in communion with the Roman See and in greater or less degrees of subjection to it; but it was not till the Tridentine Council had, so far as it could, obliterated those ancient landmarks, and consolidated everything together, that there emerged to human view "the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches." The thing and the name, alike monstrosities and contradictions, were unknown till the year 1564. There were, also, various doctrines, usages,

theories of the schools all floating about in uncertainty, held here, denied there, and these that same Tridentine Council consolidated, and petrified, and improved, under *anathema*, as Articles of the Faith. And so the Tridentine Creed is as new as the Tridentine organization, each being about three centuries old.

These facts explain the position of such men as Dean Colet. Members of national Churches, and free to hold or deny, without *anathema*, what afterwards they could not have so held or denied, they lived and labored and died where God had allowed them to be placed. But who cannot see that after 1565, possibly after 1545, when that ill-omened Council opened, a question, before unknown, must have been sharply presented to them? And who can doubt how conscience and conviction would have answered it, and what course they must have taken?

#### ART. IV. — SOTERIOLOGY FROM ST. CYRIL TO ANSELM.

ST. CYRIL of Alexandria, Patriarch of Alexandria, was a prominent antagonist of Nestorianism, † 444, the year of Nestorius' death. In his writings we find exalted conceptions of the dignity and worth of Christ's sufferings. Though at first he went to the very verge of Eutychianism, in his later works he held that the union of natures was not so intimate as to transmute the one into the other. He says, "Christ did not suffer as a mere man, but as a *God-man*." With regard to the atonement S. Cyril writes (*De recta Fide*): —

"Since the law declared the transgressor accursed, and since all were under the curse, Christ took this curse on Himself, since He was worth all combined (*τὸν ὅλῳ ἀντάξιος*)."

"Since they who were the servants of sin were made subject to the punishment of sin, He who was free from sin, and had trod the paths of all righteousness, underwent the punishment of sinners, destroying by His Cross the sentence of the old curse, 'being made a curse for us.'"  
(*De Incarnatione*, c. xxv.)

S. Cyril maintained the *absolute* necessity of the atonement, *i. e.* that it was the only possible way in which God could save men. In this he differed from S. Athanasius, who (as we have seen) maintained a *relative* necessity.

If we turn our eyes now to the Western Church, our attention will be at once arrested by the form and influence of its great doctor, S. Augustin. This renowned Christian Father was born at Tagaste, a town of Numidia, A. D. 345. In his early youth, though distinguished by great talents and learning, he set at nought the Christian instructions of his pious mother Monica, embraced the Manichæan heresy, and indulged in wanton licentiousness. He taught the art of rhetoric at Rome, and afterwards at Milan. At the latter place his remarkable conversion ("Tolle! Lege!" Confess. B. 8, c. 29) to Christianity took place, and he was baptized by its renowned Bishop, S. Ambrose. Returning to Africa about the year 388, he was (three years after) chosen Bishop of Hippo Regius, and died there A. D. 430.

S. Augustin developed a modified view of the dogma of "Satan's claims." (That this dogma is not altogether extinct, even among *nominal* Churchmen, at the present day, can be seen by reference to "Tracts for Priests and People," pp. 148, 149.) The Augustinian theory was, that as by the right of conquest the vanquished became the slave of the victor, so Adam, when overcome by sin, fell under the power of the devil; and as the children of slaves belong by right to their master, so also the posterity of Adam fell under the power of Satan. God could indeed have overthrown his authority by force, but this would have been contrary to divine justice. How then shall deliverance be wrought? The power of Satan rested solely on human sin. When the devil seized upon and slew the *sinless* Jesus, he overstepped his bounds, and justly forfeited his claim on all who believe in Christ.

This view he expresses in his work, *De Trinitate*, c. xiii. (*Justissime dimittere cogitur quem injustissime occidit.*) It arose partly from the peculiar view which S. Augustin entertained with regard to the nature and origin of sin. He held that it was propagated in the human soul by the act of generation; but since the Redeemer was begotten by the Holy Ghost of a pure virgin, He was by that means exempt from the stain of original sin. Of course this theory is logically inconsistent with the modern Romish dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

In other passages, S. Augustin says that Christ died in order that we might not fear death in its most cruel form. (*De Fide et Lymb.* c. 6.) The love shown by His death should arouse us to reciprocal love. "Christ has died for us. And this, because the

end of the precept and sum of the law is charity, that each should love the other; and as He laid down His life for us, so should we lay down our lives for the brethren. . . . For there is no greater incitement to love, than to excel in loving." (De Catech. Rud. c. 4.)

S. Augustin by no means makes the distinction so common in later and Protestant theology between Justification and Sanctification. Two passages in his writings (triumphantly quoted by Latin controversialists) seem to imply that man is justified by inherent righteousness. But he is careful to teach that this inward righteousness of regenerate man is entirely the work of a compassionate and merciful God. He makes Justification include Sanctification. "God justifies also by giving inward love." (Contra Jul. See also his work, De Spiritu et Lit. c. xlv.)

For this he was severely censured by the continental reformers. Luther, in his "Table Talk," remarks: "The opinion of Austin, or his manner of expression, is not always to be praised;" and goes on to point out his supposed error, and to argue, that God does not acquit the sinner because a holy character has been imparted to him, but that this is the result of his acquittal.

S. Augustin agrees with S. Athanasius in teaching only a *relative* necessity for the atonement, though he does not express it in such decided terms. "Poterat omnius, sed si aliter faceret, similiter vestrae stultitiæ displiceret." (De Agone Christian, 11.) He holds that the atonement was selected because it was the *most fitting* mode for God to work deliverance for man, and the most salutary for our race. He calls those fools who deny that God could have chosen another way of salvation, had it seemed good in His eyes. This censure would seem to fall rather sharply on the great S. Ambrose, who taught the *absolute* necessity of the atonement!

S. Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan (b. 340, † 398), the Athanasius of the West, is distinctly orthodox.

"I will not glory because I am righteous, but because *I am redeemed*. I will glory, not because I am free from sins, but because my sins are forgiven me; not because I have profited, nor because any one hath profited me, but because Christ is my Advocate with the Father, and because *Christ's blood hath been shed for me*." (De Jacobo et Vita Beat., I. c. 6.)

S. Ambrose acknowledges in a modified form the tenet of



"Satan's claims," in the use of such language as this: "Oportuit hanc fraudem diaboli fieri, ut susciperet corpus Dominus Jesus, et corpus hoc corruptibile, corpus infirmum, ut crucifigeretur ex infirmitate." (In Ev. Luc.)

S. Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople (b. 344, † 407): —

"As if one should cast a person into prison for a debt of ten obols, and not himself only, but also his wife and children and domestics, on his account; and another having come, should not only pay down the ten obols, but should freely give ten thousand talents of gold, and should conduct the prisoner to a palace — thus hath it befallen us; much more than we owed did Christ pay down, and so much more, as a boundless sea exceeds a little drop. (In Ep. ad Rom. hom. x. 17.)

Near the close of the sixth century we find an author, whose views of the doctrine are firm and clear.

This was S. Gregory the Great, Archbishop of Rome. He was of noble parentage, but at an early age gave himself to a life of devotion and religious studies. Consecrated Bishop of Rome about the year 590, he declared distinctly that no Bishop was entitled to the appellation of *Universal Bishop*. He is memorable as the author of the mission under S. Augustin of Canterbury, which resulted in the conversion to Rome of the Anglo-Saxon nations. His death occurred in the year 604.

In treating of the atonement he lays great stress on the *reality* of the sacrifice offered in the death of Christ. (See his Comment. on the Book of Job, b. 17, c. 46.) He says in another place: —

"To this end the Lord appeared in the flesh, that He might arouse the life of man by admonition, stimulate by affording an example, redeem by dying, restore by rising from the dead." (Moral. xxxi. c. 6.)

He held a new view of "Satan's claims." The Redemption was the result of a conflict, in which Jesus vanquished the devil. Christ conquered in that He did not commit the slightest sin. Thus he made good the overthrow which had befallen Adam, and destroyed the power which the devil had founded on this overthrow. Compare this sober theory with the preposterous view advanced by Origen, and a great difference will at once be perceived. The doctrinal views of S. Gregory are clearly and logically expressed, and he appears in every respect a man of sound orthodoxy and devout life. (See his memoirs by Laû and by Böhringer.)

With the era of S. Gregory the Golden Age of Church Literature is closed. But, before we pass into the Mediæval Period, it is but right that we take a brief survey of the Doctrine of the Atonement as taught in the *Hymns of the Church*. If the doctrine were to be found *only* in these hymns, it might be said to be founded on the language of poetry and rhetoric; but, after the sober dogmatic statements, which have preceded, we are bound in justice to acknowledge that these hymns are not merely sentimental, but that they teach *definite doctrine*. The arch-heretic of Natal admits as much by expunging such passages from his hymnal. Most venerable of all is the *Gloria in Excelsis* of the second century. "O Lord God, *Lamb of God*, Son of the Father, *that takest away the sins of the world*, have mercy upon us."

The Ambrosian *Te Deum* of the fourth century: "Te, ergo quæsumus, famulis Tuis subveni, quos pretioso Sanguine redemisti."

All later hymns are attuned to the same key. In the most ancient of them we read:—

\* "Christ, our God!  
Thou wast content in Thy good will  
To come in the flesh,  
That Thou mightest redeem those Thou hadst made  
From the bondage of the enemy."

Another:—

"And voluntarily enduring the Cross for us,  
By which, restoring the first Adam,  
He saved our souls from death."

Another:—

"Thou, who on the sixth day and hour,  
Didst nail to the Cross the sin  
Which Adam dared in paradise;  
Rend also the handwriting of our transgressions,  
O Christ, our God, and save us!"

Later, in the Ambrosian hymns, we find such stanzas. In the hymn, *Christe, qui Lux es et Dies*:—

"Thy servants, purchased with Thy Blood,  
Yet burdened with their mortal load,  
Remember, Lord! be present here;  
Defender of the soul! be near."

*Mediæ noctis tempus est*:—

"And we the ancient foe repel,  
Redeemed by Christ's own Blood."

*Christe, Rex cæli, Domine : —*

"Thou, spotless *Lamb*, cam'st down from heaven;  
 Thou hast *Thyself* a victim given,  
 Hast saved us from destruction's flood,  
 And washed our robes in *Thine own Blood*."

*Hic est dies verus Dei : —*

"They see to Christ the guilty cling,  
 And reap at once the blessed Life.  
 O admirable Mystery!  
 The sins of all are laid on Thee;  
 And Thou, to cleanse the world's deep stain,  
 As Man dost bear the sins of men."

*Ad cœnam Agni providi : —*

"His holy Body on the Cross,  
 Parched, on that Altar hung for us,  
 And drinking of His crimson Blood,  
 We live upon the living God."

*Jesu, nostra Redemptio : —*

"What compassion vanquished Thee,  
 Brought Thee to the shameful Tree —  
 Bearing our transgressions there —  
 Thy redeemed from death to spare!"

As the author of "The Voice of Christian Life in Song" (to whom we are indebted for the translation) has well said : —

"How frequently the image of the Paschal Lamb recurs in these hymns, the words '*redeemed by Thy Blood*,' and the thought of Jesus bearing death in our stead, the Just submitting willingly to the penalty that the unjust might be redeemed, liberated, and made holy ! The tone of the '*Te Deum*' thrills through them all. '*We therefore pray Thee, help Thy servants whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious Blood ;*' and it is the echo of a yet *earlier and deeper song*." Page 109.

The hymns of Venantius Fortunatus (sixth century), to be quoted at all, should be quoted entire. We can only refer to them by name. ("Crux benedicta vitet Dominus qua Carne pendit." "Pange lingua gloriosi prælum certaminis." "Salve festa dies toto venerabilis ævo." "Vexilla Regis prodeunt.") Thus in all ages has the cross of CHRIST been the great theme of the Christian poet's song, and the Christian heart's adoration.

Entering now "the Dark Ages," we shall find in the space of four centuries but two authors of very great note, S. John of Damascus and Scotus Erigena—the former a champion of orthodoxy, the latter of heterodoxy.

S. Johannes Damascenus was a monk of the cloister of S. Sabas, near Jerusalem, who died A. D. 750. He compiled from the Greek Fathers a complete system of theology in four books, which he called, "Ἐκδοσις [ἐκθεσις] ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως." This work has been received by the Holy Eastern Church as its standard work on theology; and its author is as much venerated in the East as S. Augustin in the West. Its sentences were collected chiefly from the writings of S. Gregory Naz., S. Gregory Nys., S. Basil, Pseudo-Dionysius, Nemesius, Aristotle, and Porphyry. In the twelfth century it was translated into Latin, and much used by the schoolmen of the Western Church.

In his view of the atonement, S. John Dam. follows closely S. Athanasius and S. Gregory Naz. He held that the Divine Redeemer through Himself and in Himself renewed God's image and likeness in fallen man, taught us the life of virtue, led to the knowledge of God, freed us from the tyranny of the devil, showed us how by patience and meekness to overcome the tyrant, and at length delivered us from destruction by His own death on the Cross. In his Ἐκ. πίστ. he denies emphatically the dogma of "Satan's claims." "It was necessary for God, not Satan, to receive our Ransom. For God forbid that the Blood of the Master should be offered to the tyrant." Then he proceeds, in what seems to our ears strange language:—

"Thereupon Death comes up, and, swallowing the bait of the Body, is caught upon the hook of the Divinity; and, having tasted of a sinless and life-giving Body, he is disabled, and throws up all whom he had previously swallowed!" (Ἐκ. πίστ. III. 27).

His sober, dogmatic view of the atonement is:—

"For the Maker and Lord Himself began the battle for His own workmanship, and in fact became a Teacher. And when in the hope of Divinity (θεότητος) the enemy deceives man, he is himself deceived by a defense of flesh, and there is displayed at once the goodness and the wisdom, the justice and the power of God. The goodness, because He did not despise the weakness of His own workmanship, but had compassion on the fallen, and stretched out His hand. His justice, because, when man was defeated, He did not form another being to vanquish the tyrant, nor did He by force snatch man from death; but him, whom death had of old enslaved through sin, this being the good and just One made victor again, and rescued the same being by the same, which was very difficult. And His wisdom, because He found the most fitting deliverance from this great difficulty." (Ἐκ. πίστ. III. 1.)

The Damascene holds to the *relative* necessity of the atonement.

Returning to the West, our attention is arrested by John Scotus (Erigena), "appearing like a meteor in the theological heavens." This renowned skeptical philosopher was regarded as an oracle of wisdom at the court of the ignorant French King, Charles-le-Chauve, about 877. He developed a peculiar system of philosophical theology, borrowed to a great extent from Alexandrian Neo-Platonism, and verging on Pantheism. Erigena taught that the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation is but symbolic of the pantheistic idea, that God awakens to self-consciousness in man. Man unites in his nature all creatures, visible and invisible, the extremes of the whole creation, the *material* and intellectual. He is the centre and unity of all creatures (ii: 47). If man had never sinned, there would have been in him no difference of sex, and our race would not have been cast forth from paradise. The carnal nature would not have come into conflict with the spiritual, for man would have been all mind and in union with his Maker.

Now since the first man did not remain in this blessed condition, but fell through pride, the Divine Love took another man to restore the fallen nature in the original man to its primeval state. What sin divides in man, Christ restores again to unity. Sin (to Erigena) did not arise in time, but man was *ab initio* a sinner.

He was never actually in an earthly paradise, and therefore could not have lost it at a given time. He unites in himself two natures, a carnal and a spiritual; by the latter he is the image of God; by the former, in a state of sin. Christ came to remove this disharmony. But as sin is an eternal act, so redemption is not temporal, occurring at a certain instant; but, with the incarnation, it is an eternal act. Christ, in this system, is Redeemer and Reconciler, so far as the consequences of sin are removed through His means. Of course this view is as alien to the truth as Socinianism.

We have thus traced the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ down to the time of Archbishop Anselm, whose life forms an epoch in its history, and to whom we propose to devote mostly the remainder of our Article. More time was required, than was the case with the doctrine of the Trinity, for its scientific exposition; simply because it was received in the early ages of the Church *with implicit faith*. In the days of the fathers the idea of the RANSOM was very prominent; and a *very few* inclined

to the absurd opinion of a payment made to the captor, Satan. But later on, the *judicial* aspect of the doctrine came more prominently before the mind of the Church. God was seen to be a righteous Lawgiver, whose holy Law *must be vindicated*. Satan and his kingdom appeared in their true character, as malignant and subject foes, to whom no terms of capitulation could be granted.

But the true theory of expiation was obscured in many quarters by the increasing darkness of the age. In the experience of the Western Church the sense of the enormity of sin seemed to be less vivid. During the life-time of S. Augustin there had appeared a Pelagius, who denied the doctrine of original sin, and strenuously maintained that man might live a life of perfect holiness, without the assistance of divine grace.

This baneful heresy, though refuted by S. Augustin and condemned by Councils, reappeared in the modified form of Semi-Pelagianism, and did much to corrupt the fountain of truth. Sin was gradually conceived as an evil which could be atoned for by the meritoriousness of good works; and these not even the works of faith and love, but frivolous penances and absolutions purchased by gold. Such absolutions were but licenses to sin with impunity; and thus the house of God became "a house of merchandise, a den of thieves." No wonder then that the sense of human guilt and pollution was obscured. The Blood of Christ might avail for the pauper, but was it needed by the proud noble, who could commit crimes with the red right hand, while the left reached out the gold for pardon and indulgence? Thus while the light of the Western Church still burned dimly, it was no longer "a city set upon a hill."

This decay was owing to *three* great causes.

1. There is a strong tendency in the heart of fallen man, ever conscious of his guilt, to seek freedom by his own unaided efforts. The humbling doctrines of moral inability and the need of Divine Redemption are naturally distasteful to us. We would fain purchase for ourselves, no matter what the price in money or bodily suffering, the freedom to sin with impunity. This theory of human expiation for sin lies at the root of all pagan systems of morals and religion.

2. Vast hordes of illiterate heathen were suddenly introduced into the pale of the Church, without adequate instruction in the



doctrines of Christianity. Many conquerors made it the condition of mercy to vanquished nations, that they should receive forthwith "the outward and visible sign" of Trine Immersion. It was but natural that these unconverted pagans should bring with them into the visible Church their heathen ideas of expiation. The Bible, the true *Magna Charta* of Christian liberty, was fast becoming a sealed book to the laity; while apocryphal traditions and legends were preached to the ignorant multitude as the pure word of God.

3. To add to the afflictions of the mediæval Church, the increase of papal arrogance, and the interpolation of an unauthorized *Filioque* in the Creed, led to the lamentable schism between the East and the West. The churches of the Roman obedience, deprived of the pure influence of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, became rapidly infected with decay and corruption. To this we trace the declining sense of the need of Christ's Redemption. A process of decay is one of development — but the development is false and unhealthy. A corrupting mass of organized matter teems with myriads of living creatures, the offspring of its decay and dissolution. So in the moral world the corruption of true dogma begets erroneous tenets.

There is no barrier, which can more safely withstand the inroads of heresy, than a good Creed. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are indeed the Church's rule of faith and practice; but their words are capable of perversion by the heretic. To guard against such perversions the Church sets forth her Symbols of Faith. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is amply fortified by the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds; and their words contain *in embryo* the doctrine of the Atonement. Had the controversies of the Middle Ages been brought before "the undisputed General Councils," who can doubt that the statement of our Articles of Religion would have been anticipated in the Œcumenical Creed of Christendom? The lack of such a Creed statement has been a serious loss to the Church, though we trust our pages have shown how clearly the dogma is to be found in the writings of her fathers.

As the result of this loss it was beginning to be felt and believed that the pardon of sin must to a great extent rest upon the meritoriousness of the sinner's works. It is indeed true that the human soul must *coöperate* with God's sanctifying grace, so far as

to prove the sincerity of the sinner's repentance, faith, love, and obedience. But this obedience of the regenerate heart has no redemptive merit attached to it. Were the being perfectly holy, his obedience could be no greater than that which God requires of every creature ; for the divine law exacts perfect obedience at all times and in all places. Hence the obedience of man (even were it perfect) could have no retrospective effect, so as to atone for his past sin ; and it therefore can form no part of the atonement, *which is the work of the GOD-MAN alone*. God indeed requires obedience of the redeemed as a proof of their faith and love ; but it is the obedience of the child, who obeys his father from gratitude and affection ; not the service of the hired laborer, receiving salvation as the reward of his good works.

With the age of Anselm a new era opens in Soteriology. The early fathers of the Church had passed away, and none arisen to take their place. For centuries a thick cloud of ignorance and superstition had overspread the West ; but in the rise of the scholastic philosophy we hail the dawn of modern thought and civilization. The philosophy of the schools (imperfect as it was) contained within itself much of the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. Thus it became indeed a *school* for future generations.

The Soteriology of the scholastic period begins with the Anselmic theory of Satisfaction. Its renowned author was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, A. D. 1033, of noble parents, named Gundulf and Ermenberga. Reared in the shadow of the mighty Alps, by the tender care of a pious mother, his youthful soul was filled with noble thoughts and lofty aspirations. At the age of fifteen he resolved to consecrate his life to the exclusive service of God, but the stern prohibition of his father delayed the accomplishment of his purpose. For many years he endured with meekness his cruel father's ill treatment ; but at length, unable longer to bear with his harshness, he escaped in disguise over Mont-Cenis and made his way to France.

At the age of twenty-seven (1060) he became a monk at the monastery of Bee in Normandy, of which Lanfranc, his predecessor in the See of Canterbury, was then prior. At the end of three years he succeeded Lanfranc, in the office of prior, and devoted himself to a religious life of the most ascetic character. Some of the monks through jealousy opposed his elevation ; but their hostility was speedily disarmed by the kindness of Anselm, who soon won the love of all.

For thirty years (1063-93) he held the offices of prior and (1078) abbot, while the fame of his learning filled the surrounding countries. Meanwhile his feudal chief, William the Conqueror, had acquired by conquest the English throne, and Lanfranc, Anselm's former prior, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in the year 1070. At his death (1089) the See remained for four years vacant.

On the fourth of December, 1093, Anselm was consecrated as the successor of Lanfranc by Thomas, Archbishop of York. Soon after the King, William Rufus, needing money to carry on the war with his brother Robert, demanded supplies of Anselm, which that prelate refused to pay. William, who, as the monk Eadmer says, "did not think himself a complete monarch unless he melted the mitre into the crown, and engrossed the possession of all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal," banished (October, 1097) the Archbishop. Anselm retired to a monastery in Calabria, where he completed his *Cur Deus Homo?* as an answer to Roscelin and Abelard.

The sudden death of William Rufus, in the year 1100, raised to the throne of England Henry I., who recalled Anselm to his See. After many controversies and long journeyings the health of the aged Bishop at length gave way. During six months, though deprived of rest and appetite, he was at his desire carried every day to assist at the Holy Eucharist, till at length on Wednesday of the Holy Week (April 21, 1109) he entered into rest at Canterbury, in the sixteenth year of his episcopate, and the seventy-sixth of his life, and was buried in his cathedral.

His great work on the Atonement of Christ is entitled *Cur Deus Homo?* (Why God Man?) In this book, under the form of a dialogue, he undertakes to answer philosophically the great question: "Why was God made Man, in order that by His death He might save men, when it appears as though He might have effected this end in some other way?"

Boso, a youthful friend and disciple of Anselm, for argument's sake, addresses to his preceptor such questions as these:—

"What reason or necessity was there for God to have been made Man, and by His death to have restored life to the world; whereas He might (it would seem) have done this either by another—an angel or a man—or by a mere act of His own will? In whose power were we held, from which God could not have delivered us except by redeeming

with such labors, and at last with His own Blood? If He could not do all this by a simple command, is He then Almighty? Or is His wisdom infinite, if He be unwilling? In whose power is hell, or the devil, or whose is the kingdom of heaven, but His who made all these things? Does He not show to the good angels how much He loves them, though for them He does not suffer such things? How, then, for the conquest of the devil must God needs come down from heaven? These are what unbelievers seem able to object against us." (C. D. H. B. I. c. 6.)

In replying to these questions Anselm goes over the whole ground of the doctrine. At the very outset he shows that the need, of Redemption is *not* grounded in the absurd fable of "Satan's claims." Satisfaction is to be rendered solely to divine justice.

"That it was necessary (*debuisse*) for God, in order to deliver man, to contend against the devil by righteousness, before He did so by might; so that, since the devil had slain Him in whom there was no cause of death, and who was God, he should justly lose that power, which he had over sinners, otherwise God would have done him an injustice, since he held possession of man justly, for he had not taken him captive by violence, but the said man had given himself up to him of his own accord — all this to my mind seems to have no force at all." (B. I. c. 7.)

Anselm replies to such objections that the devil had *no just claim* upon man.

"For if the devil or man had been their own, or had belonged to any one else than God, or had remained in any one else's power than God's, perhaps this argument might be rightly used; but when neither the devil nor man belongs to any one else than God, and out of the power of God neither of them exists, what cause is there for God of necessity to plead with His own, concerning His own, and in His own, but merely to punish His servant, who persuaded his fellow-servant to forsake their common Lord and go over to Him, and as a traitor had received the runaway, as a thief a fellow-thief, together with what he had stolen from his Lord? For each of them was a thief, since the one, at the other's persuasion, had stolen himself from his Lord. If God were to act thus, what could be done with greater justice? Or if God, the Judge of all, were to take man, who is, as we see, His own possession, out of the power of one who so unjustly takes possession of him, whether for the purpose of punishing him in some other way than by the instrumentality of the devil, or for the purpose of sparing him, what injustice would there be in this, — since, although it be just for man to be tormented by the devil, yet the devil would be unjust in tormenting him? Man, indeed,

deserved to be punished, and by none more fitly than by him who persuaded him to sin. But the devil never merited any right to punish him."

But now the objection arises, that—

"It seems contrary to reason that the Most High should stoop to such humiliations, and that the Almighty should do anything with such toil and labor."

To this Anselm replies by calling attention to the "Two Natures in one Person."

"When we say that God suffered any humiliation or weakness, we do not understand this of the loikeness of His impossible nature [*i. e.*, the Godhead], but of the infirmity of the human substance which he took." (B. I. c. 8.)

Anselm goes on in the eleventh chapter to show what it is to make satisfaction for sin.

"He who does not render to God the honor due Him, robs God of His own, and thus dishonors Him; and this is to sin. Moreover, so long as he does not pay what he has stolen, he remains in guilt; nor is it enough to restore the thing stolen, but he must also make amends for the insult done to God." (B. I. c. 11.)

In the next chapter he shows that God could not forgive sins from mercy alone; for this would be tolerating injustice in His kingdom, since in that event the guilty and the innocent would fare alike. "Injustice would then have more liberty than justice; which is manifestly inconsistent."

In the sixteenth chapter he undertakes to show that "the number of angels who fell must be restored from men;" and in the twentieth chapter, that the debt of sin cannot be paid by the obedience or penitence of man; since, even if these could be perfectly rendered, they would be no more than what God requires of us, and hence could have no value as an expiation for sin.

"Truly in your obedience, what do you give to God which is not His due from you, to whose command you owe all that you are, and have, and are capable of?" (B. I. c. 20.)

In the next chapter he goes on to show that this grievous debt is caused by the enormity of sin, which is disobedience to God's will; and that it is better that 'whatever is not God' should perish, than that the creature should be allowed to disobey the Creator with impunity.

"Judge then for yourself, if it be not contrary to the honor of God that man should be reconciled to him with the charge of this affront still upon him, unless he shall first have retrieved the honor of God by overcoming the devil, even as he dishonored God by being overcome by the devil." (B. I. c. 22.)

Having shown in the First Book of the *Cur Deus Homo* ? that man must render satisfaction to God for his sin, and yet is morally unable<sup>1</sup> to do so; Anselm proceeds in his Second Book to prove that the Mediator must be a God-man, and that the salvation of man can be effected *only by Christ*.

"Anselm. This cannot be done, unless there be some one to give God, in amends for the sin of man, something of more value than all which is not God.

"Boso. So we agreed.

"Anselm. He, who could out of his own give to God something greater than all below God, must needs be greater than all which is not God.

"Boso. I cannot deny that.

"Anselm. Now there is nothing above all which is not God save God Himself.

"Boso. True.

"Anselm. No one therefore *can* make this satisfaction except God Himself.

"Boso. So it follows.

"Anselm. But yet no one *ought* to make it except man; otherwise *man* does not make satisfaction." Hence it logically follows that satisfaction, "which no man *can* make except God, and which no one *ought* to make except *man*, must be made by a GOD-MAN." (B. II. c. 6.)

In the next chapter he proceeds to show that both natures must be preserved in their integrity, and not mixed into a third and different nature.

"Therefore, that the God-man may do this, it is necessary that the self-same Person who is to make this satisfaction, be perfect God and perfect man, since He *cannot* make it unless he be very God, and He *ought not* to make it unless He be very man. It is therefore necessary that these two entire natures should meet in one Person, even as the body and the rational soul meet in one man; since otherwise it cannot come to pass that the self-same Person be perfect God and perfect man.

"Boso. I approve of all you say." (B. II. c. 7.)

In the eighth chapter he undertakes to show *whence* this Nature should be assumed.

<sup>1</sup> We see no reason yet (though writing from a Catholic stand-point) to renounce the philosophical distinction between *natural* and *moral* ability, which we learned at Andover.



"If God form a new man not of Adam's race, he will not belong to the race of Adam; and hence cannot make satisfaction for that race. . . . But it is necessary that the Atonement-maker should be of the same race as the sinner. . . . And, further, if the race of Adam be lifted up again by any man who is not of his race, it will not be restored to that dignity which it would have had if Adam had not sinned, and so will not be entirely restored, and the purpose of God will seem to have failed." . . . "In four ways God may form man, namely: from a man and a woman, as constant use shows; or of neither, as He created Adam; or of man without woman, as He made Eve; or from woman without man, which He had not yet done." . . . "Therefore, as man's sin and the cause of our damnation took origin from a woman, so the Medicine of sin and the Cause of our salvation should be born of a woman; and that women should not despair of salvation, since from woman had proceeded so great an evil, it was becoming for the reëstablishing of their hopes, that this great good should come of a woman." (B. II. c. 8.)

In the next chapter he argues that the Divine Nature must be that of the *Logos* — the Second Person of the Trinity.

"If any other person were incarnate, then there would be two Sons in the Trinity, namely: the Son of God, who was Son before the Incarnation, and He who was Son of the Virgin through the Incarnation. Also, if the Father had been incarnate, there would have been *nephews* in the Trinity, etc." (B. II. c. 9.)

This is a little too refined and scholastic a speculation!

The fourteenth chapter shows the *infinite value* of Christ's sufferings and Death for our race.

"*Anselm.* If that Man were present, and you knew who he was, and it were told you, 'Unless you slay that Man, this whole world, and everything which is not God, will perish;' would you do it to preserve the whole creation?"

"*Boso.* I would not, even if an infinite number of worlds were spread before me.

"*Anselm.* What if it were said: 'You must kill Him, or all the sins of the world shall fall upon you?'"

"*Boso.* I would answer, that I would rather bear all other sins, not only of this world, past, present and future, but whatever else can be conceived of, rather than this single sin. And I say this not only of His Death, but of the slightest injury that could be inflicted on Him.

"*Anselm.* You think rightly."

We may remark *en passant* that in the sixteenth chapter Boso denies (and Anselm assents to his denial) in very strong terms the modern papal dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

"The very Virgin of whom He was taken was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did her mother conceive her; she was, moreover, born in Original Sin, since she sinned in Adam, in whom all have sinned."

Thus, what now is for devout Romanists "a doctrine necessary unto salvation," was to Archbishop Anselm, a zealous adherent to the See of Rome, a soul-destroying heresy. So much for Papal Infallibility and "development of doctrine!"

In the nineteenth chapter Boso inquires, "Why Christ need submit to death, when so many martyrs like S. John Baptist, had died for the truth?"

"*Anselm.* No man but He ever gave to God by dying what he would not lose some time of necessity; or ever paid what he did not owe. But He, of free will, offered to the Father what He would never lose of necessity; and paid for sinners what He did not owe. . . . For He gave for others (to whom He [as God] owed nothing but punishment) His own precious life, yea, *Himself* even so great a Person, with such a ready will."

Chap. xx. "Why the salvation of man follows from His Death?"

"*Anselm.* If a great reward is not given to Him, or to some one else, the Son will seem to have done this great thing in vain.

"*Boso.* That would be an impious thought.

"*Anselm.* It must then be given to some one else, since it cannot be to Him." . . . "And on whom could He more consistently bestow the fruit and recompense of His own Death, than on those for whose salvation (as the reasoning of truth has taught us) He became Man?" . . . "God did not need to come down from Heaven to overcome the devil, or to employ justice against him to deliver man; but God demanded of man that *he* should overcome the devil, and that he who had offended God by sin should satisfy justice." . . . "Whatever was required of man he owed to God, not to the devil." (B. II. c. 20.)

Chap. xxi. "Now the mercy of God, which seemed to perish, when we considered the justice of God and the sin of man, is so great, and so consistent with justice, that we can think of nothing greater or more just. For what can be more compassionate, than that God (the Father) should say to the sinner, condemned to eternal torments and unable to redeem himself: 'Take my Only-begotten Son given for thee?'—and the Son Himself, 'Take me and redeem thyself?' For they say this (as it were) when they call us unto the Christian Faith."

Chap. xxii. "Why *the devil* cannot be reconciled?" This is shown by the fact that God, the Son, took upon Him the nature of

Man, not that of angelic beings. And even were He to take the nature of an angel, this would not suffice, since angels are not (like men) descended from a common parent.

In his concluding chapter (23d) Anselm shows that the doctrine of the Atonement is a sure proof of the truth both of the Old and New Testaments.

We have thus attempted a brief synopsis of this celebrated book: let us now examine the Anselmic system as a whole. It is designed to meet the plausible objections to atoning Sacrifice, which the Christian philosopher must encounter. Anselm lays down very distinctly the *absolute* metaphysical necessity of the Atonement. Whoever does not give God the honor due Him, "robs God of His due and dishonors Him" by sin. On this rests the necessity of compensation, or punishment. Man must restore to God the booty taken from Him, and, as a compensation for the insult, he must give more than an equivalent. Such is the satisfaction which the sinner owes. If he fails to give this satisfaction for sin, then punishment must take its place to vindicate the honor of God. The punishment must correspond "to the measure of the sin." But sin is an *infinite* offense against God. So important is the Will of God, and the observance of it even to the smallest particular, that it is "greater than all which is not God," more important than the preservation of all created things.

So great is the smallest sin that it cannot be removed by the destruction of all created things. If satisfaction is proportioned to sin, man must give to God "something greater than the whole created universe." But when man suffered himself to be conquered by Satan, "he took from God all the good which He intended to accomplish by human nature." This, also, he must restore to God. But all these requisitions are moral impossibilities. Hence arises the absolute necessity of satisfaction.

These thoughts were not foreign to the mind of the Church, but were now for the first time reduced to *systematic statement*. Anselm is the first teacher who plants himself squarely on the ground of *philosophy* and *metaphysics*.

The old theory of "Satan's claims," presented in its various grotesque forms, may be called the *mythical* theory of the Atonement, and indeed it bears a striking likeness to the legends of heathen mythology. It is the mythical spirit of paganism striving to gain a foothold in Christian dogma. The Arian heresy of a "subordinate God" may thus be regarded as mythological in character.

But with the introduction of the scholastic theology, a new period begins. Hegel has said: "The Church Fathers begat the Church, for the developed spirit needed a developed doctrine; but in later times there arose no longer *Patres Ecclesiæ*, sed *Doctores*." The materials of theology were now prepared, and the task of the schoolmen was, not to determine what doctrines were orthodox, for that had been done by the Councils of the Church; but to reduce the acknowledged dogmas into one harmonious system. Hence this era has been well termed the "Systematizing Period" of Church history.

The doctrines which God has revealed to His Holy Church, may be in many points *beyond* the limited range of human reason; but in no respect are they *contradictory* to the right judgment of an enlightened understanding. A scientific value can often be given them by showing that they are based on metaphysical grounds; for to such arguments alone will the mind of the skeptic give heed. Scholasticism would not have fulfilled its mission, had it not achieved a rational idea of the principles of the Faith. Its standpoint was reflection: its aim, to make clear the grounds of each doctrine, through the help of the reflecting mind, and by this means the understanding was enlightened and satisfied. Men at that day began to question what their fathers had implicitly believed on the strength of *tradition*: they sought rational grounds for their Faith. The aim of the schoolmen was to search the foundations, give proofs, and illustrate dogma by definitions and distinctions of every sort.

"It was" (remarks D. Baur) "a world of abstract, transcendental ideas in which the spirit of the times, still fettered by the external authority of the Church, passed from the immediate relation of Church Faith to dialectics and metaphysics."

It was, in reality, the beginning of the end — the dawn of the Reformation.

Anselm, with the spirit of a true Christian philosopher, undertook the investigation of that theme, whose depths can never be sufficiently explored. But the great *defect* of the Anselmic theory is, that it does not leave sufficient room for *Divine mercy*. If God's distributive justice be *literally* satisfied, — if our *debt* has been fully *paid* for us by Christ — where, then, does forgiveness come in? According to Anselm, God's mercy consisted solely in providing the Atonement — in offering the Sacrifice. Any other form of mercy he thought inconsistent with the attribute of justice. He under-

takes to show that the Divine nature is limited by its own completeness and perfection in the work of redemption.

"Not to punish sin is to let the sinner and the guiltless stand on the same footing, which would be unbecoming in God." "But," says Boso (C. D. H., I. c. 12), "since God is so free as to be subject to no law and to no one's judgment, and so kind that no one excels Him in kindness, and since nothing is right or proper but what He wills, it seems strange to say that He can in no wise forgive injury done to Himself, when we are wont to beg from Him forgiveness for the offenses we commit against others."

To this Anselm replies:—

"If we say that what God wills is right, and what He wills not is wrong, we are not to understand that if God willed anything improper, it would be right because He willed it."

He illustrates this by saying that if God willed to lie, falsehood would not therefore be right. It is the glory of God that He wills ever to be truthful.

"When one says, 'If God wills it, it is right;' he speaks only of those things which it is becoming in God to will. Hence God cannot let the sinner go unpunished, without a satisfaction."

Anselm defines *sin* as "the withholding from God what is due Him from man." This, he says, is the meaning of the petition, "Forgive us our debts." Man owes the entire subjection of his will to the Divine law. Satisfaction for the past cannot consist in beginning to subject the will again to God. The honor due to God in the past must be restored to Him. How, then, can man render this double satisfaction? It is plainly impossible. But, since this inability to discharge the debt is the result of a sinful act of man's free will, he is not released on account of it. If a debtor should destroy all his property, this act would not release him from his obligations to his creditors. Man is at all times bound to honor God, and, since through his sin he has robbed God of His honor, he is bound to restore it to Him. True, indeed, God cannot be *objectively* deprived of His honor; but He must also *subjectively* preserve His honor for the sake of His creatures.

Here we must notice two contradictions in the theory of Anselm. (1.) He denies that God can be deprived of His honor, and yet builds an argument on such deprivation by drawing a shadowy distinction between subjective and objective. (2.) At the end of his work he extols the love and mercy of God. But if Christ has *literally* paid our debt for us, and perfectly satisfied *distributive* justice

in our behalf, what becomes of God's claim on our obedience? Then the only love and mercy displayed in the Atonement is the acceptance of Christ instead of us, as a "*quid pro quo*" for human sin. There is no true and proper forgiveness of sin and divine mercy here. We are led on by a rapid current to the "*Blood-Theory*" of the New England Calvinists, which culminated in the Socinianism of Massachusetts!

But to proceed with Anselm's view. In *two ways* may Divine justice be satisfied. (1.) By the *eternal punishment* of the sinner. Sin is an infinite evil, and therefore the Satisfaction for it must be infinite. The element of infinitude may come either from the duration of suffering, or from the dignity of the Person who suffers.

(2.) Hence divine justice may be satisfied by the agency of *another being*. Here everything will depend on the nature and character of the Being, who is to be the Mediator. It would be defrauding justice to substitute a less value for a greater. With regard to the significance of punishment, and the manner in which it preserves the honor of God, Anselm remarks: —

"Either man of his own free will gives God the subjection due him by not sinning, or by making amends for his sin; or else God conquers him by tormenting him against his will, and thus shows Himself his Lord, which man wills not to acknowledge. Note, also, that as man by sinning takes away what is God's, so God by punishing takes away what is man's. For not only is that man's which he already possesses, but also that which is in his power to possess. Therefore since man was so created, that he could possess happiness if he did not sin; when for sin he is deprived of happiness and every good, he pays, though against his will, for what he took away. And, although God does not need for His support what He takes away from man, He uses what He takes for His honor, by the very fact of depriving man of it, for, by depriving him of it, He proves that the sinner, and all that he has, are subject to Himself." (C. D. H., B. I., c. 14.)

The Substitute must be "greater than all which is not God," and therefore must be God Himself. On the other hand, Man must render satisfaction for the sin of man. Hence the two natures must be united in one Person. But whence shall this God-man derive His Humanity? Manifestly from Adam, and as the Offspring of a pure Virgin.

This necessary value of the atoning Sacrifice is due to the fact that sin is an evil of infinite magnitude. Man should not sin for



the sake of the whole world ; for it is written, " What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul ? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul ? " Mat. xvi. 26.

If man is unable to give such an infinite satisfaction, his inability does not excuse him, since it is the result of his own sin.

" On the contrary it serves to increase his guilt, because he has caused this inability ; so he is doubly guilty, once that he has sinned, and again that he has made himself the slave of sin. The working of sin never excuses the sin which was its cause."

This is an acknowledged principle of human law. The plea of drunkenness is not a valid excuse for crimes committed while in a state of intoxication : it is rather an increase of guilt. Since the debtor is insolvent, his debt must be paid by another, or he must suffer the penalty of the law. Obedience and suffering were not *due* from the Humanity of Christ. This Humanity was perfectly sinless, and so primitive justice had no claim upon it. Christ alone, of all our race, was conceived and born without the taint of Original Sin. He could have sinned, had He so willed ; but, in obedience to the dictates of His pure moral nature, He could not so will. He gave Himself to death voluntarily, without guilt ; and His Death outweighed the number and magnitude of all human sins.

He gave unto God, for the sins of his brethren, a Life, which had never been forfeited to justice through His own guilt. Since the God-man is sinless —

" He is not subject to death, the debt of sin, which all other men, as sinners, pay to the justice of God. Adam would not have died, had he not sinned ; much less would the innocent Christ be subject to death, since he is also God." C. D. H., Bk. II. c. 10.

But *can* He die ? Is it possible for Him to suffer the penalty of the law for another ? " Yes," says Anselm, " but not on common grounds like other men, who are mortals." Mortality pertains to the *corrupted* nature of man. " If He, as God, is Almighty, He can give life when He will and take it again : if he could not do this, He would not be Almighty." The God-man, then, is so constituted that He will not of necessity die, for He is omnipotent ; nor yet as a punishment for His guilt, since He is innocent ; but He can die of His own free-will, if it be expedient so to do. Anselm shows (C. D. H., Bk. II. c. 14-17) that the Satisfaction of Christ is more than an equivalent for the sins of all humanity. He says, " The Life of the God-man is greater, incomparably, than

those sins." The sin of slaying the God-man was greater than all other sins put together, and the Life of the God-man was higher than all other good. Therefore, so immense a good must reach to the blotting out of the guilt of the whole world; and, indeed, much further, for it is of an infinitely greater value.

Neander blunders about Anselm, as he did about St. Irenæus. He says (Vol. IV. p. 500), "The idea of the passive obedience of Christ was far from Anselm." In this view D. Baur concurs. But the "*Cur Deus Homo?*" clearly proves the contrary. As we have before remarked, the great defect of the Anselmic view is, that it seems to leave no room for forgiveness. If Christ has literally paid our debt — if God's distributive justice is strictly and exactly satisfied — if the Divine law has been literally and completely fulfilled for us all by Christ, what further claim has it on our obedience? under what obligation are we to obey it? Distributive justice is an attribute which prompts the possessor to give every one his due, to treat every being *exactly* as he deserves to be treated. The aim of Anselm and his School was to prove that God's distributive justice has been *literally* and fully satisfied in the Atonement of Christ. This view, pressed to its logical conclusions, exalts the attribute of justice, at the expense of mercy and love. The saving work of Christ is degraded to the level of a pecuniary transaction for the ransom of man.

Baur denounces the Anselmic theory on this ground, that in it the justice of God *suppresses* the attribute of love. It is Redemption for the sake of God, not for the sake of man. He says (*Versöhnungslehre*, p. 177): —

"Anselm is driven to an expression, which denotes the Atonement as an indwelling act of the Divine Being. The Son in His atoning Death sacrificed Himself to the Father and the Holy Spirit, or His Humanity to His Deity, *i. e.*, the Godhead restored its honor in Him, reconciling Itself with Itself. (*Deus Filius ad honorem suum se ipsum sibi sacrificavit, sicut Patri et Spiritui Sancto.*) When, on the other hand, the assertion is continually repeated, that it was not necessary for God to descend from heaven for the salvation of man (*Deus tamen non egebat, ut de cœlo descenderet, ad vincendum diabolum; sed ab homine Deus egebat, ut diabolum vinceret*)" [Baur translates Latin curiously!], "it is easy to see that the entire question, '*Cur Deus Homo?*' must be thrown out; or if not, we dare not look at the consequences which flow from these premises. This collision between an inner necessity in the Being of God and the free-will of God, pervades the whole Anselmic examination."

There is, indeed, a slight foundation for such objections; but Baur has shamefully exaggerated the difficulty. He has grossly misrepresented Anselm; and, in fact, the whole paragraph is a manifestation of the malignity of Pantheism against faith, rather than a sober statement of a sound Christian philosophy.

The Anselmic theory *weakens* the attributes of love and mercy in God, but does not entirely "*suppress*" them, as the Tübingen Professor claims. God's love to man is still manifested in a tender form — self-sacrifice. Baur forgets that there are *two* ways of maintaining justice, and that God chose the more expensive. "The compassion of God, which appeared to be lost, we have found to have nothing greater."

In the Anselmic view there are *three* distinct acts of Divine mercy. (1.) In providing, at such an infinite cost, a complete satisfaction to justice. (2.) In God's acceptance of this substituted satisfaction. (3.) In the personal application of Christ's merits to the redeemed.

In this view Archbishop Thomson substantially concurs: —

"The system of Anselm is, indeed, open to criticism, but not for the introduction of the word sacrifice. So far is it from being an undue development of Holy Writ, that it falls far short of it in the completeness of its statements. As the Atonement transcends all our means of exposition, it must needs be that the more exactly it is fitted to any analogous human affairs, the more entirely will some of its complex elements be omitted from the description. Hence, for example, there is danger lest the Atonement degenerate into a transaction between a righteous Father on the one side, and a loving Saviour on the other, because in the human transaction, from which the analogy is drawn, two distinct parties are concerned; whereas in the plan of salvation, one will operate, and in the Father and the Son alike, justice and love are reconciled. Again, the reconciliation effected by Christ, appears rather as a bringing God into harmony with Himself. His mercy with His justice, than as a reconciliation of man with God. The passages of Scripture that speak of the wrath of God against man, are not explicable of Anselm's system. The exclamation of the Baptist, that Jesus is 'the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world;' the prophecy of his sufferings by Isaiah (c. lii.); the words of Peter (ii. 24), that He, 'His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree;' and passages of like import in St. Paul's writings (Gal. iii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 21), can only find place with Anselm by a very forced interpretation. His scheme is mainly this: that the merit of the perfect obedience of Jesus was so great as to deserve a great reward, and that in

answer to the prayer of the Lord, this reward was given in the form of the salvation of His brethren. But Christ does not appear in this system as groaning and suffering under the curse of the world, as He does in Holy Scripture. Until the time of Anselm, the doctrine of the Atonement had, within certain limits, fluctuated with the change of teachers; the doctrine itself was one and the same, but this or that aspect of it had been made prominent. Anselm aimed at fixing, in one system, the scattered truths; and the result has been that he, like his predecessors, made some parts of the truth conspicuous to the prejudice of the rest." (Aids to Faith, pp. 404, 405.)

Yet, in spite of these drawbacks, the theory of Anselm was (philosophically considered) a vast advance on preceding speculation, containing, as it does, nearly all that is essential to orthodoxy. It has exercised a vast influence, and chiefly for good, on the theology of the Church; and was regarded with the utmost reverence by the Continental Reformers. The "*Formula Concordiæ*," a Lutheran Symbol (*e. g.*), follows to a great extent the Anselmic satisfaction-theory in its definitions.

---

#### ART. V. — ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY.<sup>1</sup>

*The Apostolic Fathers, Tatian, Theophilus, Clementine Recognitions, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, Tertullian, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Origen.*

It is not strange that even cultivated and sincere minds are sometimes embarrassed by the conflicting claims which agitate Christendom. Did only questions arise touching individual faith in the great facts and truths of the Gospel, difficulties would be comparatively slight. The evidence in favor of the authenticity and credibility of those books of Scripture containing the essential doctrines of the Cross, and the guiding principles of duty, are so palpable to unprejudiced Reason, that pious and patient research cannot long be mistaken. The miracles, the prophecies, the internal proofs of the Bible, tried by the ordinary rules of legal testimony which govern courts of justice, are sufficient to establish belief on a foun-

<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George St. New York: Scribner, Melford, & Co., 654 Broadway.

dation firm as that of the eternal mountains, which have stood for centuries, unshaken by storm or earthquake. When to this are added the experiences of a regenerated heart, and the fruits of an improving life, the cumulative proof is not only satisfactory, but overwhelming.

When, however, the Christian passes from the faith of the individual, to the claim of the Church, his difficulties begin. But his perplexities are such as could have had no existence during the Apostolic century. He would then have found an almost universal concurrence in the great facts and doctrines of our holy Religion. He would have discovered established in the commanding commercial and political centres of the world, and at last in all cities, Bishops, deriving their authority from Christ, through Apostolic hands, and who alone had power to ordain Deacons and Presbyters, and perform the holy rite of confirmation. He would have witnessed Christianity diffusing itself from its selected seats of influence, by means of its three divinely appointed orders, throughout the wide limits of the Roman Empire. He would have seen the sacrament of Baptism regarded as a regeneration of the Holy Ghost, and the sacrament of the Eucharist regarded not only as a remembrance of a crucified and ascended Lord, but a spiritual feasting, by faith, on His Body and His Blood, while the Priest, as in all the venerable Liturgies of the most ancient times, would have been esteemed a typical and evangelical offerer to the Almighty Father. He would have detected, for more than two centuries, no trace of prayers for the dead, of invocation to saints, of prostration before images, of papal usurpation, or any of those corrupt additions to faith and practice which marked a more degenerate period. He would have indeed seen a Primacy partly the result of circumstances, and partly of expediency, first attaching to Jerusalem as the revered mother of our Religion, then passing to Rome as the political centre of the Empire; then, with its rising power as a mere metropolis, inclining to Constantinople, but always considered, for centuries, as changeful and temporary, and never esteemed as a source of organic life, an essential headship, a depositum of infallibility, a supreme authority which was to dominate kings, to sway nations, to subjugate the world. We venture to assert that any unprejudiced person, simply reading the accounts of the Scriptures and the writings of the earliest Fathers, would find the Apostolic Church of the pure centuries reproduced in the

Anglican Church, viewed separately from the state, and the American Church, regarded in both its Protestant and Catholic aspects, as established in our own vast republic.

Profoundly impressed with the truth of these views, it is with no ordinary interest that we regard the translation of the works of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. They will expose to the gaze of many readers, truths which have been long concealed in ponderous volumes of obscure Greek and Latin. They will present to us a more vivid picture of the Primitive Church, and familiarize us with her simple, her venerable, her majestic image. They will strengthen our confidence in those principles of Faith and Order, which constitute the foundations of our ecclesiastical system. Especially are the Fathers preceding Origen deserving our attention, since after the period of that learned and illustrious, but often fanciful writer, and perhaps as a consequence of his bold speculations, errors in both doctrine and practice began to stain the pristine purity. We propose here to quote somewhat copiously from their pages, for the purpose of showing how closely the Church of the first three centuries resembled the Church in America.

Let us begin with what pertains to ORDER. Here we encounter familiar words. We find Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, mentioned in terms which continually recall our standards. The Churchman perceives that he is not in an alien family, but amid the scenes of his own household, and we venture to assert that the same feeling can be experienced by no other modern religionist. Clement, the friend of St. Paul, in his first Epistle, where he mentions Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, evidently refers to their original types under the Mosaic Dispensation. He says:—

“Where and by whom He desires these things to be done, He Himself has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things being piously done, according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable unto Him. Those, therefore, who present their offerings at the appointed time, are accepted and blessed: for, inasmuch as they follow the laws of the Lord, they sin not. For His own peculiar services are assigned to the High Priest, and their own proper place is prescribed to the Priests, and their own special ministrations devolve on the Levites. The layman is bound by the laws that pertain to laymen.”

Here we have intimated to us the germ of the Scriptural and Apostolic institution of the ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. The order of the old dispensation plainly suggested the order of the new



dispensation. Aaron, and Priests, and Levites, with their offices spiritualized and ennobled by the genius of the universal Gospel, are reproduced in Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon. The unbroken continuity of succession is preserved and perpetuated through the ages, down to the end of the world. Among a multitude of modern sects is never heard a terminology which was constantly occurring in the conversation and the writings of Primitive Christians. Words common in our own service, in our sermons, in our books, and an inheritance from Apostolic times, are completely unknown to the denominations of our day. At the close of the first century we find proof of this fact in the shorter and admitted Epistles of St. Ignatius. In writing to the Ephesians he says: "As to my fellow-servant Burrhus, your DEACON in regard to God, and blessed in all things, I beg that he may continue longer, both for your honor and that of your BISHOP." "Wherefore it is fitting that ye should run together, in accordance with the will of the BISHOP, which thing also ye do. For your justly renowned PRESBYTERY, worthy of God, is fitted exactly to the BISHOP, as strings to the harp." "Let us be careful, then, not to set ourselves in opposition to the BISHOP, in order that we may be subject to God." "It is manifest, therefore, that we look upon the BISHOP as we would upon the Lord Himself."

St. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Magnesians, writes: "Since then I have had the privileges of seeing you, through Damas, your most worthy BISHOP, and through your worthy PRESBYTERS, Bassus and Appolonius, and through my fellow-servant the DEACON, Sotio, whose friendship may I ever enjoy, inasmuch as he is subject to the BISHOP as to the grace of God, and to the PRESBYTERY as to the law of Jesus Christ."

And similar language we find in all the Ante-Nicene Fathers. We do not pause to discuss the lists of Eusebius, tracing the succession in various places to Apostolic men; we do not linger to show how impossible to have introduced a new government without controversies of which we find no trace; we do not stop to collect the incidental proofs which, in their united strength become demonstration. We only say, scattered along the pages of these precious volumes are innumerable evidences, that every reason which impels a modern Christian to present his child for Baptism, or to observe the Lord's Day, should constrain him to receive the Apostolic Order, appointing Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons for the government of the Church.

And to modern organizations, retaining the Episcopal name, while denying the Episcopal office as a representative of the Apostolate, how strange to find on the pages of the Primitive Fathers that designation, so hated and despised, which indicates perpetual links in a single chain of authority, binding the visible Church to Christ her invisible Head. Let them ponder the significance of a word, disregarded even by the Romanist, who traces all ministerial power to any present Pope, — a word only among ourselves familiar and revered. St. Irenæus, in his great work against Heresies, says : —

“It is in the power, therefore, of all in every Church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the Apostles, manifested throughout the whole world, and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted Bishops in the Churches, and the *successions* of these men to our own times.” “For they were desirous that these men should be very perfect, and blameless in all things, whom also, they were leaving behind as their *successors, delivering up their own place of government* to them.” “By indicating the very ancient and universally known Church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, as also the faith preached to men, which comes down to our times by means of a *succession* of Bishops.”

How widely, also, does the language of St. Irenæus, in regard to the authority of the Church, differ from that of modern Denominationalism, and how exactly does it agree with that of the Catholic Churchman. Hear this venerable Father : —

“But it has, on the other hand, been shown that the preaching of the CHURCH has been everywhere consistent, and continues in an even course, and receives testimony from the Prophets, the Apostles, and all the disciples — as I have proved — through those in the beginning, the middle, and the end, and through the entire dispensation of God, and that well-grounded system which tends to man’s salvation, namely, our Faith, which *having been received from the Church*, and which always, by the Spirit of God, renewing its youth, as if it were some precious deposit in an excellent vessel, causes the vessel containing it to renew its youth also. For this gift of God has been entrusted to the Church as breath was to the first created man — and the communion with Christ has been distributed throughout it, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest of incorruption, the means of confirming our faith, and the ladder of our ascent to God. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God ; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace, but the Spirit is truth.”

Now let us approach the opinions of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, in regard to the sacrament of Baptism. We find that they are simply gathered and concentrated into the language of our own inimitable formularies.

St. Barnabas writes:—

“Further what says he? ‘And there was a river flowing on the right, and from it arose beautiful trees: and whosoever shall eat of them shall live forever.’ This meaneth that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear of God and trust in Jesus in our spirit.”

The Recognitions of Clement employ the following language, expressing, doubtless, the Christian consciousness of the age:—

“He instituted Baptism by water amongst them, in which they might be absolved from all their sins, on the invocation of His Name, and for the future, following a perfect life, might abide in immortality.” “Meantime He has commanded us to go forth, to preach and invite you to the Supper of the heavenly King, which the Father hath prepared for the marriage of His Son, and that we should give you wedding garments, that is, the grace of Baptism.”

How striking and significant the following inimitable words of the eloquent St. Hippolytus:—

“Wherefore I preach to this effect: Come, all ye kindreds of the nations, to the immortality of Baptism. I bring good tidings of Life to you who tarry in the darkness of ignorance. Come into liberty from slavery; into a kingdom from tyranny; into incorruption from corruption! ‘And how,’ saith one, ‘shall we come?’ By water and the Holy Ghost. This is the water in conjunction with the Spirit, by which Paradise is watered, by which the earth is enriched; by which plants grow, by which animals multiply, by which man is begotten again and endued with life; in which, also, Christ was baptized; and in which the Spirit descended in the form of a dove. For he who comes down in faith to the laver of regeneration and renounces the devil, and joins himself to Christ; who denies the enemy, and makes confession that Christ is God; who puts off the bondage and puts on the adoption, he comes up from the Baptism brilliant as the sun, flashing forth the beams of righteousness, and which is indeed the chief thing, he returns a Son of God, and joint heir with Christ.”

Justin Martyr says:—

“As many as are persuaded, and believe that what we teach and say is true, are instructed to pray, and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them.

Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are *regenerated* in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated."

Tertullian in his work against Marcion, plainly treats Baptism as securing a "remission of sin," "the regeneration of man," "the bestowal of the Holy Ghost," and esteems it "a Sacrament of Salvation."

St. Cyprian writes: —

Assuredly the same *spiritual grace which is equally received in Baptism by believers*, is subsequently either increased or diminished by our conversation and conduct."

The Nicene Creed was simply a formal and authoritative announcement by an Ecumenical Council of a doctrine taught by the Saviour, the Apostles, and the Fathers: "I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins."

Nor are the testimonies less uniform and striking in regard to the Holy Eucharist. Here we find, too, the exact doctrine of the Church. We discover the true mean between the gross Romish dogma, and the loose Zwinglian view. If the words in one place would literally indicate a corporal presence, in another place they are so qualified and restrained as to show that the believer feasted not carnally, but spiritually on the Body and Blood of a present Saviour.

St. Ignatius exhorts the Philadelphians: —

"Take heed that ye have but one Eucharist. For there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to show forth the unity of His Blood."

Justin Martyr says: —

"And this food is called among us the Eucharist, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, having been made Flesh by the Word of God, hath both Flesh and Blood for our Salvation, so likewise have we been taught, that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus who was made Flesh."

St. Irenæus thus expresses himself: —

"As we are His members, we are also nourished by means of the Creation. He has acknowledged the cup as His own Blood, from which He

bedews our blood, and the bread He has established as His own Body, from which He gives increase to our bodies. And just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground fructifies in its season, or as a corn of wheat falling into the ground and becoming decomposed, rises with manifold increase by the Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then, through the wisdom of God, serves for the use of men, and having received the Word of God, becomes the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ, so, also, our bodies being nourished by it, and deposited in the earth, and suffering decomposition there, shall rise at their appointed time, the Word of God granting them resurrection to the glory of God."

Here is language expressing thoughts identical with those conveyed in the words of our Communion Office, and which are repeated by our Clergymen in every celebration of the Holy Eucharist, when they present the bread and the wine to the believer.

But it is to be observed in all the volumes of these Fathers, from the Epistles of Clement in the first century, to the treatises of Origen in the third century, there is no warrant for the doctrines and practices which are Romish as opposed to Catholic.

Surely had the Papal system existed, we should have discovered its traces in the clear light of those writers who lived nearest to the period of our Saviour. Search these venerable pages! Do you discover a single prayer for the departed? Do you find one instance of adoration to the Virgin? Do you meet any supplication of saints and angels? Do you notice a vestige of that stupendous system of mediation where creatures approach our Redeemer as a terrible Judge, clouded by wrath and burning with vengeance, and veil His glory as the only Intercessor with the Father? Where is the slightest evidence that the Priest converted the holy symbols carnally into the Body and Blood of our Lord, and presented them to the throne of Heaven in awful sacrifice? Where is the proof that the will of man was ever to hide from the people those Divine Oracles communicating the will of God? Where are the secrets of the heart extorted by a Priest before the believer shall partake the Sacrament of Life? Where can we detect an assertion of the universal supremacy of an infallible Pope, wielding a spiritual sceptre over earth, and claiming control over the very entrance to Heaven? Not in the Apostolic Fathers, not in Tatian, Theophilus, or the Clementine Recognitions. Not in Justin Martyr, Tertullian, or Clement of Alexandria. Not in Hippolytus, Irenæus, or St. Cyprian. These writings demonstrate that Romish Innovation was the creation of a later period.

Yet, while the works of these Fathers afford such invaluable assistance in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and such incontestable evidence of the Faith and Order of the Church, they also give proof that their authors were not inspired. We occasionally find traces of painful puerilities, in strange contrast with the simplicity, the purity, the majesty of the Bible, and which remind us that infallible truth is not in the individual opinions of particular Fathers, but the authorized declarations of the universal Church, as expressed by her Œcumenical Councils. In illustration we need only notice the chapter in St. Clement, on the resurrection, where the fable of the phoenix is treated as a fact, and the imagination of St. Irenæus that our Saviour, representing all the phases of human life, attained an old age before his crucifixion.

In conclusion, we strongly recommend the purchase of this "Ante-Nicene Christian Library" by our Clergymen. Where they cannot command the means, let the Parish come to their assistance. No works will so confirm faith in the Divine institution and mission of our Church.

---

ART. VI.—THE LATE GENERAL CONVENTION — THE  
FILIOQUE AND INTERCOMMUNION.

THE revelation of the mind of the late General Convention upon the subject of intercommunion with the Eastern Church, must have inflicted severe disappointment upon the friends and promoters of this movement; and we believe we do not venture too much in thinking that sufficient ground was furnished for the fear that the disappointment is destined to be an enduring one. Instead of indications of dissolving prejudice, growing earnestness, and ripening dispositions upon the subject, there were plainly to be discerned variously unfavorable moods, of aversion, indifference, distrust, and reserve, as its friends sought to engage for it the sympathies of the Convention. The one fact, however, upon which we chiefly rely to justify these observations, is the invincible repugnance that met every disposition, or the appearance of a disposition to reform our version of the Nicene Creed in the Oriental sense. This, we must insist, was a most discouraging sign, in view of the vital relation of that point with the whole



question, and too significant to be offset by resolutions continuing or modifying committees, or expressing general aspirations after Unity, or even for looking into the bearings of the question, so far as it may be raised among the Russian populations in the newly acquired territory of Alaska.

This kind of action means very little, in most cases. It is suffered in silence, at best, by those who are unwilling to oppose measures desired by brethren for their own satisfaction, and thus suffered for the reason that it is not final, and that it will be time enough to interpose when the subject is pressed to definite issue. Little hope therefore is to be gathered from such general proceedings or expressions upon a subject of the nature of the one in question. And when we consider how long the question has been before the Church, how earnestly its advocates have argued and pleaded for it, and how well calculated it is by its own nature to inspire a strong interest, were there nothing but ignorance and indifference to overcome, we may justly infer that the little advance secured for it in the Church generally, as well as the immovable attitude of the late Convention, are to be traced to intelligent and well grounded objections, which, if not strong enough to exclude and silence the subject altogether, are sufficient to prevent all serious measures in reference to it.

There was, then, to our mind, an unfavorable meaning in what might be termed the marked inconsistency between this unyielding, almost hostile, attitude of the Convention towards every form in which the *filioque* question was brought forward, and the renewed aspirations after intercommunion with the East. We do not know what practical ideas of intercommunion were before the minds of those who, at one moment, refused to listen to any proposals for modifying our position in reference to the interpolated phrase in the Creed, and at the next voted for resolutions that bear almost the character of prayers for the achievement of such restored communion with the Eastern Church. It has the appearance of deliberately closing the door and then praying that it may be opened. But the most rational solution would be found in the presumption that many of those voting against all suggestions for altering the Creed, and in favor of entertaining the question of intercommunion, did not perceive or reflect upon the bearing of the one point upon the other; but acted as traditionally principled against any alteration of the Prayer Book, or touching the settled

formularies of the Church ; and on the other side, regarding desires for Christian Unity as pious sentiments always seasonable, and proper to be put in any form of resolution or committee. This, we believe, is the utmost that can be made out of the results of the Convention upon this subject, and, as the only definite part of them is all against the movement, it is only fair to infer that nothing different or inconsistent was intended in its more general expressions and proceedings.

Thus it becomes important for those who have taken in hand the business of restoring relations of communion with the Orientals, to form a careful estimate of the temper of the Convention upon the first real issue ; upon the formal suggestion of the very initiating step in any true progress. If a revolt prompt and decided is met here, upon the point most generally understood, brought forward with much preparation and under several different forms ; a point, moreover, not necessarily involving any doctrinal difference or discussion, and reducible *in itself* to matter of formal accuracy, — what are we to expect when a succession of graver difficulties and more intricate questions is revealed as barring the way to the desired consummation ? We repeat, that to those who have some knowledge and appreciation of the magnitude of these difficulties, the treatment of the *filioque* question has a significance and prophecy, against which the sum of all that was done by the Convention in an apparently favorable sense upon the general subject, is of little account.

But we are not left to infer the mind of the Church upon this primal question solely from the deliberation and action of the General Convention. To those who gave themselves the trouble to gather up the general feeling and the scattered evidences of informed and settled opinion, the conclusion must be irresistible, that the subject of intercommunion with the Eastern Church does not possess attraction enough, nor appear as a duty grave and pressing enough to weigh against the danger to the peace and integrity of our own Church certain to accompany any attempt to alter the Creed. Press the matter home with all its consequences, upon the few even who would be disposed to face these dangers to our own peace, for the accomplishment of what they regard as a prime duty ! Even among these there would be many of the wisest made to pause at the last moment in the face of an act that would erect the same barrier between ourselves and the Church of

England, which is not free to go with us in the change, were she disposed, — that now separates us from the Orientals. In other words, the same class of Churchmen with us who would do most to improve our relations with the Eastern Church, would be the last to do aught to disturb those which bind us to the Mother Church. They would reflect that if the one impulse would be fraternal, the other would be unfilial and contrary to every implied or recognized obligation. We do not altogether sympathize with the principle of this objection, so far as it would operate to bind our action to the shackled movements of the Anglican Church; but the objection would be found to have great force in the question under discussion, and was doubtless at the root of the opposition manifested in the General Convention.

In this indirect way the result of the Lambeth Conference will be found unfavorable in its influence upon this question. Called with the view to promote the principles and spirit of Christian Unity by knitting in closer alliance first the different branches of the Anglican communion, for united effort upon all Catholic elements outside, its aim would scarcely be thought best advanced by a sacrifice, at the outset, of the means. Nearly one half of our House of Bishops crossed the ocean to take part in that Conference, and its proceedings have since been heartily ratified by the remainder. It was a formal declaration before the world of the fullest unity, and a mutual pledge among themselves of fresh and hearty sympathy between the Churches represented. Thus, however wisely, it has put fresh obligations upon them to hold sacred the existing ties; obligations that would seem to be flagrantly violated by a deliberate act in one member of the body, like that of changing the Common Creed, and upon no other grounds of necessity than those which have been always familiar to the Church. Thus the party in the Church most favorable to the movement in question would encounter awkward obstacles in their own principles and acts.

Again, if we look in other directions in the Church where hostility may be expected, it may easily be predicted as coming from two classes of minds and under corresponding characters. The first is that of natural antagonism, coming from what is called the Evangelical side of the Church. The antipathies of that party in the Church to this question are instinctive, and will exist as long as the party exists, and questions in the Church are made party

questions. This whole movement is viewed as one aiming to promote ecclesiasticism and sacramentalism — to increase the influence of tradition and weaken that of Scripture teaching in the Church, and so import errors of doctrine and practice into our midst. The uncompromising opposition of this section of the Church must therefore always be reckoned upon. No possible dilutions of the offensive parts of the doctrine of the Orthodox Church of Russia — the type of all the Oriental Churches — can apologize to them for language which, in its plain and obvious sense, is held as unscriptural and false. No explanations or disavowals of objectionable intent can render tolerable the use of a symbolism or the presence of visible objects in worship, which are the natural vehicles of superstition and suggestive temptations to a semi-idolatry. The confessed impossibility of restraining popular abuse of things devised for intelligent and profitable use, condemns the things themselves, by a familiar principle of the Gospel; excludes them not only as unlawful corruptions of the simplicity of Christian and spiritual worship, but also as dangerous temptations to sensuousness of thought and reliance in religion. Such would be the reasoning of those to whom we refer, and it must be confessed there is much truth in the objection, too much to be easily answered. Strongly Evangelical minds would therefore instinctively shun every manifestation of sympathy and fellowship with a Church of such doctrinal and ritual character; preferring not to be forced either to approve or condemn it as a Church.

Midway between these extremes, we find the very large body of conservative men, in whose deliberate and sober judgment the Church is ever safe, entertaining a grave distrust both as to the wisdom and the practicability of reviving actual intercommunion with the Eastern Church. This distrust has grown with the light thrown upon the question by the labors of official and voluntary inquirers. The influence of their judgment, upon the merits of the question itself, has been to counsel a halt at the threshold beyond which they can as yet see nothing but difficulties and a succession of sacrifices like that demanded at the outset, and in the end no assurance of a complete attainment of the object. They are disposed to exercise a rigid scrutiny and demand the clearest evidence upon all points. If they approach the subject without prejudice, it is with no intention to permit a glossing over

of facts as to the dispositions and conditions finally to be encountered in any serious overtures to the Orthodox Oriental Church. They require full guarantees that the dignity and Catholic character of their own Church are not to be brought to a submissive attitude before exclusive pretensions. Let it be understood that such minds in the Church refuse to take anything for granted upon this subject. They will accept no detached, fragmentary, or partial accounts of the doctrinal and ritual character of the Russo-Greek Church, nor any probable theories of its favorable estimation of us. The question has two sides. It is plainly supposable that even though that Church would consent to accept us with our supposed deficiencies, we might not find ourselves able in conscience to accept it with its known redundancies. What we already know renders possible such a final attitude of the question. Thoughtful men therefore would pause, as they have paused, before suffering the entering wedge to be inserted in the form of the rejection of the *filioque* from the Creed.

Such are the dispositions and expectations of the Church upon this subject of Intercommunion with the East. We have gathered and stated them fairly and plainly we think, and for an object. We desire that our position be clearly understood. It has not been defined in terms, though, as we have seen, plainly enough indicated to those who wish to guard themselves against present mistake or future disappointment. We commend this study especially to the attention of the committees appointed under the Resolutions of the General Convention. There is danger that the Resolutions themselves may be misunderstood as declaring a purpose to accomplish this object, rather than as a prayer or wish that no insuperable obstacles be found in the way of its accomplishment: as much an invitation to the Orthodox Oriental Church of Russia to draw near to us in just knowledge and proffered communion, as an intention on our part to ask admission to her communion. Thus understood, the Resolutions will be likely to lead to inquiries that will satisfy the expectations, and justify or remove the prejudices we have indicated. The results might be reached without great delay. The sources of information are abundant and accessible. It is scarcely necessary to point them out to the Committee. Perhaps the little work of the Abbé Guettée—as the most recent and authentic—might serve the purpose of a text book. It is a brief but sufficiently full and clear exposition of the

doctrine of the Orthodox Church. The dedication of the work by permission to the Empress of Russia, and the high favor enjoyed by the Abbé Guettée in the Russian Church, leave no doubt as to the accurate and authorized character of his *Expositum*. Other and larger works are available, from which may be gathered the needful light to set this question at rest.

We will venture to indicate here the points upon which our Church desires to be answered in clear and unequivocal terms — and then hazard a prediction as to the answers that will be obtained.

1st. Would the omission of the *filiolus* from the Creed on our part secure any real advance towards intercommunion ?

No. Because intercommunion must be based on community of doctrine ; and the change in the Creed would relieve us only from the charge of schism — but not from the possibility of heresy in doctrine.

2d. Would not then this restoration of the Creed to the original form be accepted as sufficient proof of our purity in faith and doctrine ?

No. Because the articles of that Creed can be understood in an erroneous sense. And to be held in a Catholic sense, they must be interpreted by the traditions of the Catholic Church. Of these traditions the Orthodox Oriental Church of Russia has been the only faithful guardian. Therefore, her doctrine is the standard of Catholic truth and of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures as being in harmony with them and the authoritative teacher of them.

3d. Is she ready to accept our sacramental system as Scriptural and Catholic, and as therefore entitling us to her communion ?

No. She regards our sacraments as deficient in number. Of those we have retained under other names, some she regards as degraded to the character of voluntary ordinances, others as irregular though not invalid in the mode of administration.

4th. Is she prepared to accept the Apostolic origin, or valid succession of our ministry ?

No. She simply does not reject it — waiting to be satisfied by better evidence than she is yet furnished ; being, as a Church, entirely ignorant upon the subject, and not distinguishing us from the Lutheran and Calvinist elements of Protestantism.

5th. Is she prepared to admit the possibility of error in doctrine



or practice in herself; to change aught in the language of her liturgy or ritual that would be found to wound our conscience as seeming to express error of doctrine; or to change aught in the matter of her ceremonial which we as conscientiously believed and could prove to promote superstition among the ignorant; and therefore to be opposed to the doctrine and spirit of the Christian Church, as well as against Holy Scripture?

No. For the reason that, assuming to have remained the unchanged and faithful depositary of the Catholic faith and practice, she cannot admit the possibility of having erred or of holding aught that is contrary to Scripture or scandalous to a rightly informed conscience.

This would be enough for the purposes of the question among us. Should the answers we have supposed be obtained, in substance, there would be no disposition to carry the discussion into details.

It is not to the point to ascertain the views of a few of the more prominent of the Russian dignitaries — but to know what would be the probable action of the Holy Synod in reconciling the differences that would be found to exist between the two Churches; whether the Synodical action on both sides, which alone could harmonize these differences, would not take the character on our side of renunciation, submission, and conformity; and on theirs, of the simple acceptance of such acts.

In the presence, then, of well-ascertained grounds for such revelations and fears, we may judge whether converts to the intercommunion movement are likely to multiply rapidly; whether they will be found hereafter besieging the doors of an indifferent Convention to lead them in the work of self-transformation in order to satisfy a sentiment of Christian Unity; whether, in a word, the prospect of success is encouraging enough for the difficult work of reconciling conflicting ecclesiastical pretensions, and of harmonizing the theological perceptions, or blending the metaphysical and æsthetical elements of opposite civilizations.

## ART. VII.—THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

THE doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost—a doctrine which has been the subject of controversy between the East and the West for more than a thousand years—must ever be a topic of interest to the Christian scholar. And it is more than a mere topic of scholarly interest, since, as an essential part of the fundamental dogma of the Holy Trinity in Unity, it is something which concerns the Faith. Let us examine it then (in the words of our Ordinal Preface) by the light of “Holy Scripture and ancient Authors.”

1. If we examine the inspired Word of God, we shall discover but *one* verse in which the dogmatic word “*Procession*” is used. In our Lord’s words (John xv. 26) we read: “Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ.” “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, *even* the Spirit of truth, which PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER, he shall testify of me.” Our Lord indeed has said in the same Gospel (viii. 42), “I *proceeded* forth (ἐξῆλθον) and came from God;” but the difference in the Greek original is sufficiently obvious.

2. Yet it is a great and *fundamental* truth of Orthodoxy, that God, the Holy Ghost, is *as eternally and essentially* the Spirit of the Son, *as* He is the Spirit of the Father. Thus we read (John xiv. 26); “the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name;” and (xvi. 7), “I will send Him unto you.” Thus the Holy Ghost is *sent* by the Father and the Son. Again (xvi. 14), “He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show *it* unto you.” He is repeatedly called “the Spirit of the Son” in the N. T. “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of the Son (τοῦ Υἱοῦ),” Gal. iv. 6. And, “the Spirit of Christ which was in them” [*i. e.*, the prophets], 1 Peter i. 11. The word “*Procession*” is alone objectionable and extra-scriptural.

It would seem that an impartial, unprejudiced mind would reach these two conclusions: (1) that the *Procession* of the Holy Ghost is declared in Holy Scripture to be “*from the Father*;” and (2) that the Holy Ghost is as truly and really the *eternal* Spirit of the Son as He is of the *Father*.

These conclusions are abundantly confirmed by the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. Without in the slightest degree denying *the second*, they constantly and with one consent affirm *the first*. The best epitome of their views we quote at some length from a gifted writer in the American Church : —

“ We may well begin by premising the confession of Bishop Pearson, that ‘ the Greek Fathers stuck more closely to the phrase and language of the Scripture, saying that the Spirit proceedeth *from the Father*, and *not* saying that He proceedeth *from the Son* ;’ and again he says : ‘ The ancient Greek Fathers, speaking of this Procession, mention *the Father only*, and *never*, I think, express *the Son*, as sticking constantly in this to the language of the Scriptures.’ The Oriental theologians quote, on their side, clear and decisive passages from Origen, S. Athanasius, Didymus Alex., Ephraem Syr., S. Basil, S. Gregory Naz., S. Epiphanius, S. Gregory Nyssa, Cæsarius, S. John Chrysostom, S. Cyril Alex., Nonnus, Leontius, Anastasius Sin., Hesychius, S. Maximus, and others.

“ From the Latin Fathers, also, — S. Hilary, Philastrius, S. Damasus, Bp. Rome, Isaac (his contemporary), S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, S. Augustin (in many and strong places), S. Paulinus, Confession of African Bishops, Paschasius, S. Fulgentius (very strong, though as late as sixth century), Pope Pelagius, Pope Gregory the Great, Thalassius, Mansuetus, Bishop of Milan (with his Synod), Etherius, Beatus, and others ; all of which makes a very strong body of Latin proof for the Oriental view, besides their having the Greek Fathers all to themselves.

“ Now for the evidence quoted by the Latins to prove the *Filioque* as it now stands in our Creed.

“ Bishop Pearson, as we have already said, confesses that the Greek Fathers are *all* against us. But some are quoted by Romish controversialists, and we mention them to show what sort of evidence they have been *driven* to in this portion of their defense — the last defense of their position which is possible. They quote Leontius of Cappadocia, but it is a *misquotation* ; S. Gregory Thaum., — *misquotation* again ; S. Athanasius, — a false reading ; Didymus Alex., — a passage manifestly corrupted ; S. Basil, — an interpolation omitted even in several Latin editions, and not found in any ancient MS. ; S. Gregory Nys., — a passage given up as untenable, even by Petavius ; S. John Damas., — a passage abandoned by Bellarmin and Allatius as corrupted ; Leo Philos. and Constantin Harmen., — manifestly spurious, for both writers have left genuine works in favor of the other view ; Metaphrastes, — a mis-translation ; and a few others of even less weight. Surely it was a wise course in Bishop Pearson, to give up the Greek Fathers in a body, if this be all that can be raked and scraped out of them in favor of the Latin view.

"The appeal is made more confidently to the Latin Fathers, as furnishing strong passages in favor of the *Filioque*. But subsequent research, in the more critical times that have come upon us since Bishop Pearson's days, have proved that the Latin authorities chiefly relied on, are little better than the Greek ones we have just enumerated. S. Hilary is quoted, — but in flat contradiction to himself in another passage close by, and this pretended passage was never appealed to in the early stages of the controversy. It is thus proved to be an interpolation. S. Ambrose is quoted, — but the passage is corrupted, *all* the editions of that Father giving it the other way. A second quotation from S. Ambrose is both interpolated and garbled; a third is interpolated, and the word '*Procession*' is acknowledged by the Benedictines to be used in the sense of '*mission*;' a fourth is from a sermon classed by the Benedictines as '*spurious*;' and a fifth clearly refers to '*mission*,' and not to the Eternal Procession, as it would make the Holy Spirit proceed from the Son *alone*, which nobody holds.

"Ruffinus is quoted, but the reading is not genuine. Several pretended quotations from S. Jerome are mere inventions. S. Augustin is the main reliance of the Latins; but the chief proof-text is, by its very Latinity, shown to be an interpolation of the times of the Schoolmen, and does not agree with the Latin doctrine of '*Procession equally from the Father and the Son*;' it is capable of a translation, however, which would agree with the Greek view. In another place, the best MSS. are divided between a reading which would harmonize with the Greeks, and the total omission of the critical words. Another is from a sermon attributed to Alcuin, and no longer now included in the works of S. Augustin. The long disputations on the Procession, which are found in the book on the '*Trinity*' and in the treatise on S. John, are manifestly insertions of later date, as is proved by quotations made by the Ven. Bede, which do not bear a trace of the passages relied on. Another passage is a corrupt and interpolated transference from another work, in which the proof-words do not appear. Two or three other testimonies of the same sort close the list of proofs from S. Augustin.

"The one passage from S. Leo the Great, is unquestionably (from historical as well as verbal grounds) corrupt. The Confession of Eugenius of Carthage, is quoted; but this Confession is originally given in the work of Victor of Utica, where the proof-words (as usual) do not occur. An additional proof of the falsity of *all* these Latin testimonies thus far is, that Rusticus, Cardinal Deacon of the Roman Church, and acting as Apocrisarius at Constantinople (an office filled only by the ablest Western theologians), at a time *subsequent* to all these pretended Latin authorities, expressed himself as entirely uncertain of the double Procession.

"He said: '*Whether He (the Holy Ghost) proceeds from the Son*

in the same way that He proceeds from the Father, I am *not yet* perfectly satisfied,' which he certainly would *not* have said if the *Filioque* had been clearly taught for 150 years before his time, on the authority of those luminaries of the West — Hilary, Ambrose, Augustin, and Jerome; and the genuineness of this passage in the Essay of Rusticus, has never been questioned. S. Gregory the Great, was quoted at the Council of Florence, but with a false reading; and the proof alleged in another passage disappears in a Greek translation made by a Pope of Rome itself in the eighth century.

"The last stronghold of the *Filioque* is thus utterly exploded. It rests only upon an *inference* from *Scriptural* expressions, which does not necessarily follow therefrom. It has the authority of no General Council. It cannot be established by *any* clear and unquestioned passages in either the Latin or the Greek Fathers. And to make the case worse, it is supported by a vast number of *pretended* quotations which, on critical examination, prove to be spurious, garbled, interpolated, mistranslated, or misunderstood!"

Whence then came this strange interpolation in the Œcumenical Creed? An obscure and ignorant Spanish Synod (Toledo, 589) was perplexed by the Arian objection, that the Father was *essentially* greater than the Son, *because* the Creed had no *Filioque* in it. The good Synod was prompt and vigorous in its measures for the relief of orthodoxy; it inserted *Filioque* — a convenient way of settling all disputes without a troublesome resort to logic! "The Son is equal to the Father, *ergo*, the Spirit *shall* proceed also from the Son!"

Unfortunately, all good Christians in the world did not accept as binding, the definitions of Toledo. Like many novelties, it spread rapidly in the West, while the East declaimed against it. The innovation became known in the East and excited the displeasure of the Greeks about 767. (See *Annales Lauriss*; ad an.: Pertz, I., 144.) Even in the West learned men protested. That great Doctor of the age, Alcuin, so late as A. D. 800, writes concerning the *Filioque*: —

"Beware, beloved brethren, with the whole power of your minds, of the new sects of *Spanish error*; follow the steps of the Holy Fathers in the Faith, and join yourselves, in most sacred union, to the Universal Church. For it is written, Remove not the ancient landmarks which your Fathers have set. And refuse to insert novelties in the Creed of the Catholic Faith; and refuse to accept, in ecclesiastical offices, traditions unheard by former times; advance along the public road of Apostolic

doctrine, nor turn from the King's Highway, by the by-paths of any novelty, to the right hand nor to the left."

Yet, in spite of such solemn warnings, the unauthorized clause was inserted in the Creed by the West at the bidding of Pope Nicholas I. A. D. 867. (See Mansi, xv., 355, and Dr. Neale's *Eastern Church*, "Introd." pp. 1147, sqq.) The natural and orthodox inference from these *indisputable* premises would seem to be, that every branch of the Catholic Church is bound to get rid of the interpolation as quickly as possible. Yet we find this conclusion strangely disputed by the leaders of extreme views, in our own communion. It is said that such an omission would subvert the doctrine of the Holy Trinity!

1. The eminent Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford (a fair representative of the school of latinizing Catholicity), writes thus (August 22, 1868) to the author of this article, as he has written elsewhere publicly:—

"I believe that, if you were to drop the *Filioque*, your members would come to drop, also, the belief of the Eternal Procession 'from,' or 'THROUGH' 'the Son,' and would believe only in Eternal Procession from the Father, and a temporal mission by the Son. But then they would believe in a different God, *i. e.*, in God existing in a different way from that in which He does exist."

The strange logic of this is, that the American Church, by accepting the true symbol as held by the Greeks, would at once fall into a heresy, which even the Greeks reject and abhor!

2. Then, for the *neological* or Broad Church party, we are favored with the opinions of her Majesty's chaplain at Paris:—

"Will you permit me to say frankly that not only in popular estimation, but by its strict logical consequences, such an act ['excision of *Filioque*'] would seem to land the Church in Arian and Sabellian conclusions. The matter seems to me very simple. The doctrine of the Trinity in Unity implies the absolute co-equality of the three divine persons, otherwise we should have one greater and two lesser. . . . Now, if you say the Father is not only first by order of degree, which is admitted, but He is the first, as the *sole fountain of Deity*, as essential and original Deity, and so the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, — then you *destroy co-equality*, you make a greater and two lesser deities, and the unity of the Godhead is lost."

3. An American Divine, representing "*Evangelical*" views most intense, arrives at a somewhat similar conclusion:—



"He (the Holy Ghost) proceeded from both (Father and Son), as possessors with himself of the fullness of the Godhead. The vital importance of the doctrine lies in the consequences which follow the denial of it. Such denial robs the Son of God of the essential divinity and absolute equality and *independence*" [*sic!*] "of His Godhead. Hence we cling to it (the *Filioque*) as the *prime jewel of the crown of the Son of God!*"

And elsewhere he gravely informs us that he would not join in "the Greek movement," if it were "*backed by all the angels in heaven.*" And we fully believe him.

1. The great age, profound learning, fervent piety, and ardent desire for reunion which are characteristic of Dr. Pusey, render his views the object of respectful attention, even to those who think his Latin sympathies carry him too far. We will endeavor to show that his fear of lurking heresy in our communion is groundless.

2. Of Mr. Gurney we cannot speak with so much patience. He seems to be animated by an intense dislike of *orthodox* doctrine, and the Greek Church. His spirit has been twice most signally rebuked: once, by the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, and again by the Bishop of Florida. We will consider his objections further on.

3. But of the third — what, ah! *what* shall we say? We fear greatly lest our excessive mirth should betray us into some unguarded expression of downright levity.

*Ινα τὸ γέλοιον εἰπῶ καὶ περὶ γελοίου πράγματος!* He, who in the face of all Church History, can boldly declare that the interpolated *Filioque* is "the crowning jewel of the Nicene Creed," is fitted to ride forth beneath Mambrino's helmet as the veritable Don Quixote de la Mancha of the *Spanish* Faith!

In the Book of Common Prayer of the P. E. Church, in the U. S., we read, in the Creed printed immediately after the Apostles', and prefaced by the rubric "¶, Or this," "Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son;" in the Litany, "O God, the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son;" in the 5th Article of Religion, "The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son." Are these words orthodox? Can we conscientiously use them?

Yes, they *are* orthodox — they express a great truth — we can use them everywhere, *except* in the Œcumenical Creed.

1. In the first place, let us distinctly bear in mind that the Anglican Church has nowhere defined the *mode* of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. So far as the *Prayer Book alone* is concerned, it might be either eternal or temporal. We are thrown back upon the Catholic Faith for a correct interpretation.

2. We do not of course accept the authority of the (so-called) General Council of Florence; but its history throws some light upon the question, "What is the orthodox meaning of *Filioque*?"

The Greek Commissioners and the Latin Council came to a mutual understanding that the two formulæ  $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  (*per Filium*) and *Filioque*, were doctrinally *synonymous*. Had the Concordat been accepted by the Eastern Church, the Great Schism would have been healed. It was rejected on these four grounds: (1.) Unwillingness to allow an interpolation in the Œcumenical Creed, except on the authority of a General Council. (2.) Fear, lest the insertion in the Creed might bring in the heresy of "two  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota$  in the Godhead," a heresy commonly, but erroneously ascribed to the Latins. (3.) Jealousy of the Papal Supremacy, and other Latin errors. (4.) The prevailing influence of the great Eastern champion, Mark of Ephesus.

Bishop E. H. Browne, in a note on the 5th Article says:—

"The great objection which the Eastern Church makes to the *Filioque* is, that it implies the existence of two  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota$  in the Godhead; and, if we believe in  $\delta\epsilon\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon$ , we in effect, *believe in two Gods*. The *Unity* of the Godhead can *only* be maintained by acknowledging the Father to be the *sole*  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$  or  $\Pi\tau\eta\rho\eta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\acute{\rho}\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , who from all eternity has communicated His own Godhead to His co-eternal and consubstantial Son and Spirit."

The Concordat of Florence gives us a clew to the orthodox interpretation of our Article. *Filioque* must be understood to mean  $\Delta\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$ , *per Filium*.

We have seen how distinctly Holy Scripture teaches us that the Holy Ghost is the eternal "Spirit of the Son"—"the Spirit of Christ." This is the recognized doctrine of the Holy Eastern Church. That great Russian theologian, Adam Zarnikoff, writes:—

"The Spirit is from all eternity the Spirit of the Son, *because* He proceeds from the Father. In that He proceeds from the Father, He is inherent in the Son, who is of one substance with the Father. No true Anglo-Catholic would refuse to accept *that* statement of the doctrine. Even the Athanasian Hymn, when its Latin is closely examined, does not

state the doctrine in a sense hostile to the explanation of *Filioque* by the words *per Filium*.

“‘ Spiritus Sanctus A’ [not EX] ‘ Patre et Filio : non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens.’ ”

The Greeks do not object to the preposition A, “by.”

While the three Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity are of equal substance, eternity, and glory, it is the sole prerogative of the Father to be unbegotten, unproceeding, the *Μία Ἀρχή*, the only Fountain of Deity. Hence the Holy Ghost must eternally proceed from Him, as our Lord Himself hath declared. But the “only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, is said to be ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης, καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, the Effulgence of His Glory and the Impress of His Essence.” (Heb. i. 3.)

In the Divine Mirror of the Logos, Christ, everything which appertains to the Father, is eternally *reflected* to the universe. The Holy Ghost, *proceeding* eternally from the sole Fountain of Godhead, the Father unbegotten, must therefore also come eternally from the sole (χαρακτήρ) Image of the Father, the eternally-begotten Son. The most accurate statement of which theological language is capable, seems to be this :—

The Holy Ghost proceedeth eternally from the Father BY (or THROUGH) the Son.

Of course the *temporal mission* of the Holy Ghost is another doctrine and, by common consent, in *that* sense, He proceedeth from the Father and the Son.

And now let us look for a moment at Mr. Gurney’s theology, which is so “fearfully and wonderfully made.” We speak not of his avowed *Restorationism*, his hostility to the Athanasian Creed, and his strongly suspected sympathy with the doctrinal views of Dr. Colenso ; but simply of his argument about Procession. He says the *Filioque* is necessary to “the *absolute co-equality* of the three divine persons.” His argument unfortunately proves *too much*. His “absolute co-equality” requires that the Holy Ghost should also proceed *from Himself* ! — and ends in a *reductio ad absurdum*.

His theology also lands us at once in the sad heresy of the two ἀρχαί. We have two co-equal Parents in the Trinity — two Fathers, and their joint offspring the Spirit ; which, on the whole, is not much better than Count Zinsendorf’s vagary, that the Holy Ghost is the *Eternal Mother* of Christ !

In a recent article in this Review, we endeavored to call attention to the anomalous condition of the text of our great Symbol. Some have thought that we wished to subvert the doctrine of the Trinity! We hope we shall no longer lie under the imputation of heresy, either latent or avowed. We cordially accept (though not liking *the word!*) *Filioque*, in the sense of *per Filium*; but we still protest against its insertion in "the Nicene Creed." No one asks its removal from the Litany. The Commissioners of 1689 would have read even there — "O God the Holy Ghost, *the Comforter and Sanctifier*, have mercy," etc.

We are weak enough to think that in a *devotional* Litany, "O God the Son, Redeemer of the world," sounds better than "O God the Son, begotten of the Father before all worlds."

We cannot see why in the Providence of God the Church may not hereafter be reunited on the basis of the Florentine Concordat, — "that FILIOQUE means PER FILIUM." We must take care not to lose *that* great truth in a mere dogmatic belief in the *temporal mission* of the Holy Paraclete *e Patre Filioque*.

So far as Christian doctrine is concerned, the dispute about the Procession is a most dismal logomachy; there is not a shadow's difference between the Orthodox East and the Catholic West. But the interpolation in the Creed is a *vital* point. We reject Rome — its Papal Supremacy, its interpolated *Filioque*, its Immaculate Conception, its Unleavened Bread, its enforced Celibacy, its Latin rites, its winking Madonnas, and its liquefying blood of S. Januarius — in short, "its blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

But our Prayer Book, as it stands, is inconsistent with itself. It says, "the Nicene Creed ought thoroughly to be received and believed" — it bids us read it — but it gives us *no Nicene Creed!* We sincerely hope that a *majority* of our Diocesan Conventions will demand of the General Convention of 1871 a satisfactory explanation of our position in this matter. In the mean time the Presbyters might ask officially of their Bishops "a correct version."

## ART. VIII. — THE OLD ROMISH MISSIONS IN CALIFORNIA.

FAR off on the Pacific coast, for seventy years before the Anglo-Saxons took possession of California, there was recorded in that land a chapter in the religious history of the world, of which the dwellers on the Atlantic slope knew nothing. The actors in these scenes have all passed away, and but few traces are left of their works; but it may be interesting to our general readers to bring up some remembrances of those old monastic times.

By their works here we mean the permanent religious influence they should have impressed upon that new land. Physically, we still see the tracks of that great system from the Shasta mountains to the Bay of San Diego. Its gigantic footsteps are recognized in the mouldering remains of the Franciscan missions, which remind us of the former glory of the old Spanish Church.

It is a peculiarity which strikes a stranger in California, that the grand landmarks and divisions through the country are these old missions of the Church of Rome. They are referred to as the counties are in other States. You hear of the mission of San Carmel, of San Luis Obispo, of San Antonio de Padua, of La Purissima Concepcion, etc. As you travel through the country, in some retired valley, or on some beautiful river, you find their extensive and even massive buildings, now going to decay, often with the remains of wide-spread cultivation still visible about them.

It was in 1767 that these missions were commenced in Upper California. In that year the Jesuits were expelled from Lower California, when their successors, the Franciscans, turned their attention to the neighboring province, and determined to embark in its "spiritual conquest." Accordingly, in the following year, 1768, Father Junipero Serra, a Franciscan friar, was nominated Missionary President of Upper California, and with a staff of sixteen brethren, of his own Order, proceeded to their new field. Three vessels — "a seraphic and apostolical squadron," as one of their number calls it — sailed for San Diego, now the site of the most southern town in Upper California. Of these, one was never heard of again, and two arrived after a protracted voyage, which showed the deplorable state of navigation among the Spaniards at that day, both of them having lost almost all their crew by scurvy, thirst, and hunger.

A land expedition set off at the same time, and it appears that the worthy Fathers and Visitadores took their military tactics from the Bible, as well as their divinity. Father Palou relates, "that considering the land expedition not less arduous and dangerous than that by sea, owing to the many savage and depraved tribes through which they had to pass, it was resolved, in imitation of the patriarch Jacob, to divide it into two companies, in order that if one was unfortunate the other might be saved." Both, however, reached San Diego safely. "All," says the President in his report, "have arrived fat and healthy."

There they took possession of the country, the soldiers, muleteers, and servants clearing a place for a temporary church, hanging the bells and constructing a grand cross. Then, the venerable President pronounced a fervent discourse on the establishment of the mission, and they blessed the holy water and chanted their first mass. The account of their imposing religious services ends with a curious announcement. "The want of an organ and other musical instruments," says Father Palou, "being supplied by the continual discharge of the fire-arms during the ceremony, and the want of incense, of which they had none, by the smoke of muskets."

The site of the mission is about six miles from the present old town of San Diego. Some years ago, being at this place, we rode out to the mission. The road is through a country undulating with moderate hills, but, at that time, without a farm or ranch for the whole distance. Although the soil is rich for agricultural purposes, we scarcely saw a tree until we reached the mission buildings, which are surrounded, for some distance, by the old olive-trees set out by the former occupants. The site is on the side of a hill, commanding an extensive view down the valley, through which a little stream winds. These old monks had an eye for the picturesque, and when the land was "all before them where to choose," they knew full well what situations to select. At this day there is not a fairer view in all Italy than that presented by the sunny plains of San Gabriel with the old mission buildings in their centre, and the palm-trees throwing their shadows over them. In all these places they must have led a pleasant life, as far as physical comforts are concerned; in a balmy climate, nature pouring out her treasures at their feet, with all the country at their disposal, themselves the lords of the manor. Here, at San Diego,



they built a stately church of *adobes* (bricks hardened in the sun), with a long range of buildings for the accommodation of the Fathers and other officials. The slight dwellings of the numerous converts they once gathered around them, have long since passed away.

We find, from authentic documents, that in 1802 the number of converted Indians attached to the mission was 1559. About 1835, it was secularized, with all the rest, by the Mexican government, and its ecclesiastical occupants scattered from their pleasant home. It is now a station of the United States army, and when we visited it, we found it occupied by a few officers and about a hundred infantry soldiers. The clang of their arms resounds through the chambers where once the old Fathers prayed and chanted. The Church, which is very long and narrow, was then undergoing a transformation to adapt it to be used as barracks, and we could not but feel sad, as we entered it, at the air of desolation. The chancel, raised a few steps, is still perfect. There was the massive cross, sunk into the wall behind, and the brick pulpit, covered with plaster, but little injured. A very little change would have fitted it up for a temple of our faith. From before the Church, far as the eye could reach, there was the most perfect quiet resting on the landscape, yet we could not but remember that on this spot the untutored Indians of California were first taught their earliest lessons in the Christian faith. Here, first, were introduced the improvements of civilized life, and in these neglected gardens below us were planted the earliest fruits and vines; and cultivated flowers, whose seeds were brought from beyond the seas, mingled their fragrance with that which the breeze wafted from the sides of the surrounding hills.

From this mission the Fathers extended out on the north and east, until they had occupied the whole land. It was almost everywhere under priestly rule. The whole number of missions founded previous to 1786, Pérouse informs us, was fifteen; ten being possessed by the Franciscans, the others by the Dominicans. In 1831, the number was twenty-one, and the Indian population attached to them was 18,683. Each mission had allotted to it, in the first instance, a tract of land fifteen miles square, which was selected for its fertility and adaptation to cultivation. The buildings were all on the same general plan. A stately church was the prominent feature, being often adorned with paintings and the

richest ornaments. The silver plate belonging to that of San Buenaventura was valued at fifty thousand dollars. Then came the apartments of the Fathers, which were often spacious, and the granaries and workshops. The storehouses belonging to some of the large missions were of great extent. The Indian population generally lived in rows or streets of huts, about two hundred yards distant. They were either of *adobes*, or built of poles covered with dry grass, the construction of which was only the work of a day.

The riches of these missions were at one time enormous. Of money they had but little, the "circulating medium" being hides. When a ship came upon the coast to procure hides (as we see in Dana's graphic descriptions in "Two Years before the Mast"), some hundreds of beeves were slaughtered, the flesh thrown away as valueless, and with the hides they procured from the ship the few foreign articles they might need. Everything else was raised on the ground by their Indian converts, and in the southern part of the country, the orange and lemon groves soon grew up around their mission, while the pomegranate and the fig-tree easily yielded their fruits.

But theirs were literally "the cattle on a thousand hills." Their numbers seem strange to us in modern times, and remind us of the flocks and herds which Holy Writ tells us the patriarch Job possessed. The mission of San Buenaventura covered an area of country of over 1400 square miles. In that of Soledad an immense tract of land was irrigated by an aqueduct extending fifteen miles and built by the Indians. The mission became so overrun by its horses, that to preserve sufficient pasturage for other stock, they resorted to giving them away to parties who would remove them. In 1826, it owned 34,000 head of cattle, 75,000 sheep, and 250 yoke of oxen, besides its almost innumerable horses. The mission of La Purissima Concepcion contained 1,300 square miles, and so abounded with cattle that the priests gave general permission to the people of the country to kill them for their hides and tallow. The mission of Santa Inez, in 1826, was estimated, in its property, at 700,000 dollars. The mission of San Luis Rey had an Indian population amounting to 3,000. It was celebrated for its manufacture of blankets and clothing, and at one time had over 70,000 sheep, which were carefully protected, solely on account of their wool. The traveller who now

visits it in ruins, finds the long and spacious corridors, the immense arches that supported the buildings, with vine arbors and lattice work, which still give it an air of beauty and magnificence.

In those days, these missions were the only stopping places for travellers, as the Anglo-Saxon institution of taverns was unknown. When a person arrived, he was shown at once to his room, where every convenience was provided for him. If it was not meal time, a loaf of bread and some cheese, with a bottle of native wine, were sent to him, Indians were appointed to wait on him, and thus he remained the guest of the Padres as long as he chose to stay. When he departed, he was forwarded on to the next mission, where the same hospitality was repeated.

His journey was in this wise. Two Indians were provided for his guides and escort, all being well mounted, with generally six additional horses which ran loose, following the riders, and led by a mare with a bell on her neck. They set off at the top of their speed, travelling sometimes a hundred miles a day, and when one of the horses they rode began to flag, an Indian lassoed one of the free ones, the saddle and bridle were at once transferred to him, the tired one turned loose in the troop, and off they dashed again. When they reached the next mission, the Indians rested a night and then set out on their return home with their horses, while fresh ones, with guides, were provided for the traveller. Thus he went, without the slightest expense to himself, from one end of the country to the other.

About two miles back of the Bay of San Francisco, under the range of hills, is the Mission Dolores. To the Friars who founded it, the bay and city of San Francisco are indebted for their name. They were induced to give it from the following circumstances. When, in 1768, the President left Lower California to proceed to San Diego, he took his orders from the Visitador General respecting the names of the new missions and the patrons to be assigned to them; but observing that he did not point out any one which was to be that of the founder of the Order, the President exclaimed: "And is our Father San Francisco to have no mission assigned to him?" The Visitador replied: "If San Francisco wishes to have a mission, let him show you a good harbor, and then let it bear his name."

There had long before this existed a tradition, coming down from the early navigators, that on the northwestern coast, about

a hundred miles north of Monterey, there existed the entrance of a large bay, through which vast volumes of fresh water poured into the sea from rivers flowing from an unknown distance in the interior. But later explorers had not been able to find this entrance, probably because then, as now, a thick fog frequently obscured the opening of the Golden Gate. Sir Francis Drake mistook for it a bay a few miles above, to which he gave his name, designating the white cliffs which bounded it as New Albion. It is a mistake which is now sometimes made by careless navigators, and thus becomes the scene of numerous disasters. At that time, therefore, the existence of the Bay of San Francisco had come to be considered quite apocryphal.<sup>1</sup>

In the year following, 1772, an expedition was sent northward from San Diego to explore the country, and particularly to make a settlement at Monterey. The expedition returned to San Diego in six months, with the report that they could not find the harbor of Monterey, though in fact they had visited it, but did not recognize it from the description given of it by Sebastian Viscayno. Proceeding northward, however, they entered the extensive harbor of San Francisco, and as soon as the Friars who accompanied the expedition, as well as its commander, saw the fine bay at which they had arrived, they exclaimed: "This is the port to which the Visitador referred, and to which the saint has led us." They called it therefore the Bay of San Francisco, set up the Cross, and took possession.

The mission was formally founded in 1779, and its lands embraced about forty square leagues. In 1825 its stock consisted of 60,000 head of cattle, 3,000 horses, 100,000 sheep, 700 mules, 400 yoke of oxen, 30,000 bushels of wheat and barley, 28,000 dollars' worth of merchandise, and 19,000 dollars in specie; a specimen of the kind of property these old Friars held. We have now before us a picture of the mission, as it was before the coming of the Americans. It stands alone in the country, the "everlasting hills" behind it, the cultivated fields around, and before it the view of the magnificent bay. The Church is there, and the long ranges of buildings for storehouses and workshops, and the huts of the converts. Innumerable cattle are scattered over the plains, and in the foreground the half-clothed natives are walking, or careering by on horseback at the headlong speed which we now see their descendants use.

<sup>1</sup> Hon. J. W. Dwinelle's *Colonial History of San Francisco*, p. 24.

How chapped is now everything about it! In 1834 it was secularized by order of General Figuero, and despoiled of its wealth, beauty, and influence. It is now within the suburbs of a large city of 150,000 inhabitants; the "mission road" which leads out to it is becoming lined with houses, the street rail-car rumbles by it every few minutes, and the city is fast growing up around the old mission. The quiet retreat of the Franciscan Friars has lost its charm. The principal buildings are there, but that is all. The priest still holds possession of the Church, and hour after hour the old Spanish bells sound out—everything else has passed out of his hands. The quarters of the priests are turned into drinking shops, and noise and revelry take the place of the vesper hymn.

Let us look at another picture of one of these deserted missions. A few miles back of Monterey is the mission of Carmel. In 1854, being at Monterey, we drove out one day to visit this former home of the Friars. The road was through the old oak woods, where in several miles we passed but one dwelling. No settlers had come into the country to replace the Indian converts, who were scattered when the mission was secularized, and all seemed a solitude. At last we struck the Carmel river near which the mission was situated. To find it however was no easy work, as the road had been so long disused that it was overgrown with grass, and difficult to distinguish from other paths in the woods. We turned into several where the branches almost met from the sides and swept over us as we passed, but they ended in the dense forest, and we were obliged with difficulty to turn and regain the main road. We at last found the right one, and after driving for a couple of miles, emerged into the cleared fields which surround the old mission Church. The situation is beautifully selected, encompassed by the hills, and with a distant view of the ocean. The Church still stands, its front unaltered, having on one side of it the range of offices unchanged. On the other side, the huts which once formed the habitations of the Indian converts have entirely disappeared, as have the other out-buildings and corrals in which the old Fathers once herded their thousands of cattle.

We drove into the quadrangle, about 400 feet square, formed by the deserted offices of the mission. They are built of *adobes*, and are now rapidly falling to decay. A gentleman who visited the Church a few months before, found it entirely open, the doors

swinging loosely on their hinges, and all the old relics of former worship left as they were years ago. Since the mission was secularized twenty years before, there seemed to be no one to take charge of the building, nor any definite owner for the property. The priests had departed and it was left unprotected, trusting to the feeling of reverence to prevent any from molesting its contents. This was effectual enough with the old Californians who belonged to the Church, but probably had no weight with Americans who wandered that way, so that articles once devoted to sacred uses were carried off, and lately they had found it necessary to lock up the building.

At this time it was open, as the Padre from Monterey was here removing some of the ornaments and furniture to the Church there, of which he had recently become the Priest. The Church itself is lofty, with a Gothic arch, and some parts of the ornamental stone work carved with considerable skill. It is nearly two hundred feet in length, so that there is something stately in its appearance as you stand at the lower end and look up. The wall of the chancel had been elaborately gilded and painted, though the colors are now fast fading away by exposure to the air and weather. The whole building is of stone, except the chancel end, which is unfortunately of *adobes*. The roof over where the altar once stood had fallen in, and we saw that a few more rainy seasons would finish the dilapidation of the building. On the left hand, as you enter the Church, is a small Chapel for the baptistery, where the large Font, carved from a species of yellow stone, with a heavy wooden cover, stood as it did the day the last child received from it the waters of baptism. Next to it is a pretty little chapel which was used for the daily mass and vespers. The altar was still there, with a picture of angels over it, some of the heads of which are very well executed. On the altar stood the printed Gospel and Prayers, framed under glass, for the use of the officiating priest. It seemed as if he might have left it there the evening before. On the walls around were painted the *Te Deum*, Gloria in Excelsis, and other anthems, with the musical notes; so that the whole congregation could turn to them and sing in a scientific manner.

In the Sacristy — a large room on the side of the Church — we found the old paintings and images. I turned over the former, but most of them were daubs, portraits of Saints and Martyrs hideously



executed. Among them was one of a Padre landing on the coast, in his hand a violin, and the Indians seen in the background. Tradition relates, that by his performance on this instrument he first attracted his congregation, arresting their attention by music, before he began his sermon. The images are of wood, about four feet high, well carved, some with gilded mitres on their head and one (whose name I could not learn) being the statue of an African, perfectly black, with woolly head.

The *Corpus Christi*, a wax figure as large as life, representing the Dead Christ, had been left lying in the nave of the Church. It was uninjured, except that some of the panes in the glass case, which covered it, were broken. The Padre had brought out some Indians to carry it to Monterey to ornament his own Church. They were placing poles under it, to carry it like a bier. On our way back we passed it a couple of miles distant, and as we approached Monterey, groups of gayly dressed Senoras were met on the road, and it seemed as if the whole population had gone out to receive it. A few hours afterwards, the bells of the Church rang out a loud peal, and we heard the next day there had been quite a service for its reception.

This was the Padre's first visit to the place, and he therefore knew little with regard to it. He was a Mexican, speaking only Spanish, and evidently having a mixture of Indian blood. In front of the altar many of the priests had been buried, and he removed the slab from a tomb in the pavement, and showed us the coffin below in a narrow cell of masonry. Several of the tombs had lately been opened to find the remains of Padre Junipero Serra, the founder of the Church and one of the earliest missionaries in California. In this, however, they were unsuccessful.

In the tower still hung the three old Spanish bells, one of which was yet perfect, but the other two had been broken and were useless. Thirty years before, their sound, as it swept over the hills, called hundreds of Indians to daily prayers.

After leaving the Church, we walked over to an extensive pear orchard, planted by the Padres, and the fruit of which some Californians were then employed in gathering. A small house had been built in the orchard, where lived an American, who having married a Mexican wife and been many years in the country, had settled down there, usurping the grounds of the mission, to which he probably had no legal right. These were the only settlers within many miles.

And this is the picture of the change which has passed over almost all these missions. Where no population has grown up around them, the buildings are useless and are left to decay and desolation. A few only, like that in the neighborhood of San Francisco, have retained their influence. When deserted, they are soon ruined. The *adobe* buildings, when once exposed to the action of the rains, rapidly fall to pieces, so that in a few years no traces of them remain. And sometimes, the chief relics of extensive missions are seen in the olive groves or wide spread vineyards, which once imparted such charms of beauty and luxuriousness to these seclusions. About some of them every fruit and flower indigenous to a tropic or temperate zone, was cultivated with the most perfect success. They were surrounded with the orange, the lime, the lemon, the fig, the olive and the pomegranate trees, besides various kinds of the grape. Nature had lavished her richest treasures upon them, and we can imagine, somewhat, the sorrow with which the old Friars must have given their last parting look to the earthly Paradise which had been their home. It must have been like that with which in old time, and under similar circumstances, the Monks of Glastonbury Abbey abandoned their lordly domains.

We turn now to the religious influence exerted by these missions.

The life the converts, as they were called, led at the missions, was very monotonous and with little variation at any of the different settlements. One picture will answer for all. Pérouse gives it many years ago, and Forbes, who visited them in 1836, shortly before the dissolution of these establishments, reports it as being appropriate at that time. The Indians and Missionaries rise with the sun and attend mass, which lasts almost an hour. During this time their breakfast is preparing, consisting of a favorite pottage called *atole*, made of barley flour, the grain having been roasted previously to grinding. It is cooked in large kettles, and without the seasoning of either salt or butter. Then, every cottage and hut sends for the allowance for all its inmates, which is carried home in their bark baskets. Any that remains is distributed to the children as a reward for their good behavior, particularly for correct lessons in the Catechism. After breakfast, they proceed to their labors, either out of doors or within. At noon, dinner is announced by a bell, and the Indians, quitting their work, go to receive their rations. It is the same as at breakfast, varied only by the addition

of maize, peas, and beans. Then again, to work from two to four or five ; afterwards vespers, which last nearly an hour, and the day is finished by another supply of *atole*, as at breakfast. The day was thus divided between meals, prayers, and labors. The latter were either agricultural or in the store-rooms, magazines, and laboratories of the mission. The men were often occupied in combing wool, weaving, melting tallow, etc., or as carpenters, shoemakers, bricklayers, blacksmiths, etc. One of the principal occupations at the mission was the manufacture of a sort of coarse cloth from the wool of their own sheep, for the purpose of clothing the Indians. The women were occupied in spinning and other household labors. The grinding of corn was left almost entirely to them, and was always performed by a hand-mill. All the girls and widows were kept in separate houses during the day while at work, being only permitted to go out occasionally, like boys at school. The unmarried of both sexes, as well adults as children, were carefully locked up at night in separate houses, the keys being left in the keeping of the Fathers ; and when any breach of this rule was detected, the culprits of both sexes were severely punished by whipping, the men in public and the women in private.

One of the fullest accounts we have of these missions, is given by Captain Beechey, of the Royal Navy, who visited the Bay of San Francisco in 1826. As the Indians receded from the missions, it became difficult to procure materials on which the priests were to exercise their skill, and various methods were therefore adopted to entice the wild natives into their power. Sometimes this was even done by force.

"At a particular period of the year," says Captain Beechey, "when the Indians can be spared from the agricultural concerns of the establishment, many of them are permitted to take the launch of the mission and make excursions to the Indian territory. On these occasions the Padres desire them to induce as many of their unconverted brethren as possible to accompany them back to the mission, of course implying that it is to be done only by persuasion. But the boat being furnished with a cannon and muskets, and in every respect equipped for war, it too often happens that the neophytes and the *gente de razon*, who superintend the direction of the boat, avail themselves of their superiority, with the desire of ingratiating themselves with their masters and of receiving a reward. There are, besides, repeated acts of aggression which it is necessary to punish, all of which furnish proselytes. Women and children are generally the first

objects of capture, as their husbands and parents sometimes voluntarily follow them into captivity.”<sup>1</sup>

In one of these proselyting expeditions which took place during Captain Beechey's visit, a battle was the result, which ended in the first instance in the loss of thirty-four of the converts. A second expedition, however, was sent out to avenge this loss, which resulted in the capture of forty women and children of the invaded tribes. They were at once enrolled in the list of the mission, and almost as soon transformed into Christians. Captain Beechey gives the following graphic description of the process :—

“I happened to visit the mission about this time, and saw these unfortunate beings under tuition. They were clothed in blankets and arranged in a row before a blind Indian, who understood their dialect, and was assisted by an Alcalde to keep order. Their tutor began by desiring them to kneel, informing them that he was going to teach them the names of the persons comprising the Trinity, and that they were to repeat in Spanish what he dictated. The neophytes being thus arranged, the speaker began :— ‘ Santissima Trinidad, Dios, Jesu Christo, Espiritu Santo,’ — pausing between each name, to listen if the simple Indians, who had never spoken a Spanish word before, pronounced it correctly or anything near the mark. After they had repeated these names satisfactorily, their blind tutor, after a pause added, ‘ Santos,’ and recapitulated the names of a great many saints, which finished the morning's tuition.”

This seems to have constituted pretty much their spiritual training, and after a short time they were baptized and admitted to all the privileges of Christian converts.

“If, as not unfrequently happens,” says Captain Beechey, “any of the captured Indians show a repugnance to conversion, it is the practice to imprison them for a few days, and then to allow them to breathe a little fresh air in a walk around the mission, to observe the happy mode of life of their converted countrymen ; after which they are again shut up, and thus continue incarcerated until they declare their readiness to renounce the religion of their forefathers.”<sup>2</sup>

A faith impressed by such means could, of course, only be maintained by force, or by a constant appeal to the outward senses. It seems, indeed, to be the testimony of all writers who visited the mission, that the principal part of the Religion of these poor people consisted in making the sign of the Cross, and kneeling at proper times, and other mere mechanical rites of the same kind. The cer-

<sup>1</sup> *Voyage*, ii. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Voyage*, i. 13.

emonies of the Romish Church occupied a considerable share of their time. Mass was daily performed twice; besides on high days and holydays, when the ceremonies were much grander and of longer duration. Every Indian was obliged to attend all these performances, under penalty of a whipping. And this kind of discipline, to enforce kneeling at proper times, keep silence, etc., was introduced into the services of the Church itself. In the aisles and passages of the Church, zealous beadles were stationed, armed with sundry weapons of potent influence in producing silence and attention, and which were not sparingly used on the refractory or inattentive. These consisted of sticks, whips, long goads, etc., which were not idle in the hands of the officials who swayed them.<sup>1</sup>

Such were the converts from heathenism in California. It was nothing but a grievous servitude. The Friars were lords of the land, and these poor Indians were the serfs, so that Pérouse found the resemblance painfully striking between their condition and that of the negro slaves in the West Indies. Such was the influence exerted over them that they rarely attempted to break their bonds and escape to their original wilds. They believed they had hardly power to do so after having been baptized, regarding that rite as a sort of spell which could not be broken. Occasionally, however, it was done, but hardly ever with success. The runaway was immediately pursued, and as, owing to the enmity existing among the different tribes, he could not take refuge in another, his destination was known and he was overtaken and surrendered up by his cowardly countrymen.

When brought back to the mission, he was always first flogged and then had an iron clog attached to one of his legs. This had not only the effect of preventing his running away again, but held out a profitable warning to others.<sup>2</sup>

What, then, was gained to the Indians of California by the Romish missions? We have no hesitation in saying, spiritually almost nothing. No knowledge of Christianity was acquired which could be of any use in changing the character, or even elevating the intellect. The ignorant savage exchanged his barbarous worship for a superstition quite as degrading. In all the objects which our faith has in view to prepare us, by its immortal hopes, for another world, these Indians might just as well have never heard of Christianity.

<sup>1</sup> Forbes's *California*, p. 218.

<sup>2</sup> Forbes, p. 221.

And we think there was quite as little gained with regard to this world. These savages, in a balmy climate, were originally marked by a native indolence of character, and want of all independent spirit. The manner of life to which the Fathers subjected them, tended to heighten these defects, while it imparted to them no true civilization or rational improvement. This life became entirely an animal one, with nothing to think of or care for. Southey, in his "Tale of Paraguay," gives something of a picture of Indians in a similar state:—

"The bliss is theirs  
Of that entire dependence that prepares  
Entire submission, let what may befall.  
No forecast, no anxieties have they;  
The Jesuit governs and instructs and guides;  
Food, raiment, shelter, safety he provides;  
Their part it is to honor and obey,  
Like children under wise parental sway."

But, deprived of their vigorous exercise in the open air, over their native mountains, by the side of their beautiful rivers, they became debilitated in body as well as mind. Living comparatively sedentary lives at the missions, and bringing with them their native habits of filthiness, diseases were produced which swept them off in great numbers. It was the opinion of Forbes, formed from actual inspection, that in a few generations the whole race would become entirely extinct. His prophecy will be fulfilled sooner, even, than he anticipated; for now, when only thirty years have passed, but few of these tribes remain. They were, indeed, a happier and nobler race of men when tracking the wild deer over the plains, or paddling their light canoes on the bosom of their streams, than they were when shut up like cattle in the pens at the missions.

Nor do we think they gained anything in a religious point of view, to compensate them for the change. Repeating the offices of the Romish Church, or performing its ceremonies, without understanding their meaning; chanting the praises of St. Francis or singing hymns before the image of the Virgin, were certainly not occupations calculated to improve either their spiritual or intellectual condition.

And yet, there is a romance mingling with the story of these monastic retreats as once they existed in that distant land, which then was given up to their sway. And now, when we have stood near one whose Church was still used for their faith, and heard its



bells ring forth the Angelus, they seemed to carry us back to the distant Past and summon up once more the almost forgotten scenes of their former glory.

“ Their solemn music  
Still fills the wide expanse,  
Tinging the sober twilight of the Present  
With color of romance;  
We hear their call, and see the sun descending  
On rock, and wave, and sand,  
As down the coast the mission voices blending,  
Girdled the heathen land.  
Borne on the swell of their long waves receding,  
We touch the further Past —  
We see the dying glow of Spanish glory,  
The sunset dream and last!  
Before us rise the dome-shaped mission towers;  
The white Presidio;  
The swart commander in his leathern jerkin,  
The priest in stole of snow.  
Once more we see Portala's cross uplifting  
Above the setting sun;  
And past the headland, northward, slowly drifting  
The freighted galleon.  
Their voices break and falter in the darkness;  
Break, falter, and are still;  
And veiled and mystic, like the Host descending,  
The sun sinks from the hill! ”<sup>1</sup>

These, then, were the old Romish missions, and as we see the ruins of their buildings, we can feel no regret that they are entirely among the things of the past. The tribes over which their sway was exercised are rapidly fading away, and soon will be gone forever; yet they are giving place to a nobler race — to men who bring with them the refinements and advantages of civilized life. And with them, too, will come, we trust, a purer faith, and through all these valleys, and over these hill-tops, be heard the voice of prayer and praise, offered by devout and intelligent worshippers, to Him who is not to them an “Unknown God.”

<sup>1</sup> Poem by F. B. Harto.

## ART. IX. — SIR THOMAS MORE. PART II.

*Roper's and Cresacre More's Lives.*

*More's English Works.* 1557.

*More's Latin Works.*

*Erasmi Epistolæ.*

*Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography.*

*State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.*

*Froude, Anderson, Jortin, Strype, Sir Jas. Mackintosh, Campbell, Collyer, Burnet.*

It is from within rather than from without, that darkness, partial or complete, falls on our life. The valley of death's shadow, to the faithful, is bright with heavenly radiance; but great, says the Master, is the darkness, when the inward light has failed. We devote some space, therefore, not to what would be called More's days of gloom, but to those charges against him which would tend to make us doubt whether he inwardly walked in the clear light which God bestows on them that diligently seek it.

More is by many considered to have been what we would now call a Romanist. It is probable that some Roman Catholics will claim him as one of their number. He is said, again, to have been, with all his virtues, a bigot and a cruel persecutor of those who differed from him. And lastly, he is now and then charged with having shown a trifling spirit when the occasion called for solemn thought and serious words.

First, was More a Romanist? If we can show that his life and principles were such as would have led him, fifty years later, to remain till death a faithful member of the Reformed Church of England; if we can show that in many of those questions which have become the tests of the Romanist, or the Reformed, he was then not a Papist, I think we shall be proud to claim him as ours, not only for his consistent honesty, but also as a faithful Churchman, and one who shows the grace of Christ shining brightly, when almost all else seems dark and corrupted.

More lived and died, we must carefully note, before it had begun to appear, amid that conflicting turmoil of opinions, upon what principles the English Reformation would finally stand. It may suit the purposes of Romish controversialists, to date the English Reformation from the time of Henry's divorce, and the ensuing

separation of his kingdom from the Papacy, by the Act of Supremacy which declared him spiritual as well as temporal head in his dominions. But American Churchmen find much to reprobate and reject on either side, in that period of change and confusion, while they revere the overruling Providence of God which kept His Church unharmed, and restored to her soundness of doctrine while preserving her Catholicity of worship and order.

Could Henry and those who submitted themselves to his domination have had their way, the English Church would have become a purely Erastian establishment, a department of state, like that of education or the judiciary. Could another party have had their way, they would have retained the old ignorance and superstitions, and our Mother Church of England would have followed the Church of Rome into all its subsequent developments of error. And, in the third place, there were not a few, in many cases zealous, devout, and earnest, with the clearest consciousness how far the Church of their day had erred from the old paths, but ready to destroy anything in their eagerness to tear away what was really wrong, or what they deemed to be wrong. They had more zeal than discretion, more knowledge than wisdom.

It is evident that a true Churchman and devout Christian layman of those days was situated as no one, we may thank God, has been for the last three hundred years in England or the United States. And we must keep all this in mind, if we would ascertain whether the Reformed or the Romish Church may most truly claim Sir Thomas More.

The question is not, be it observed again, whether More held, as opinions, many things which are now known as distinctively Romish doctrines. For so did Cranmer and Latimer and others, whom we honor as reformers, even after the year in which More lost his life. Witness the Articles put forth under Cranmer's supervision in 1536, affirming purgatory, prayers to saints, etc. The Council of Trent had not yet declared, as articles of faith, what had been popular traditions; neither, on the other hand, had true men and faithful reformers in our Mother Church yet agreed in setting forth a truly Catholic doctrine, based on the Scriptures. We can, therefore, only judge from the tendencies of More's language, as we would from Cranmer's at the same time.

Here was the world-wide difference between these two men, in the year of our Lord 1535. Cranmer was willing to assert and

teach, and base all his conduct on the teaching that all spiritual *authority*, and not *jurisdiction* only, proceeded from the King as God's sole representative. This was asserted in words such as these: "All *authority* and *jurisdiction*, as well that which is called ecclesiastical as secular, emanates from the royal power as from a supreme head and fount of all magistracies within our kingdom." Even so zealous a reformer as Calvin acknowledged, "they that so highly advanced the King were inconsiderate; they gave him supreme power of all things, and that was it which always wounded me."

More, without being much of a theologian, understood that if Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and has ever injured itself by endeavoring to set itself in temporal matters above the state, yet, on the other hand, an earthly kingdom is not of the spiritual world, and while we render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's, we are bound to render "to God the things that are God's." This separated More from Cranmer, and Cranmer's party, by a wide gulf.

Tyndal again, and his party, zealous as they were for the diffusion of the Word of God among the people, as the one fountain of Truth, and holy living, were ready to overthrow the Church altogether. Tyndal rejected the word Church from his translation of the Holy Scriptures, substituting "Congregation" wherever it occurred.

He followed Zwingle and the Swiss into those errors which Luther hated and denounced. At the meetings for worship, held by his adherents in London, it was publicly maintained that all Christian people had the same authority, that there was no proper ministry of Christ, that any woman, for example, might lawfully celebrate the Lord's Supper. Such men, also, were separated from More by an almost impassable gulf, for they would destroy the Church for the Truth's sake, or what they revered as the truth. More trusted that God would so order things that good men in the Church, and the Truth of God in it, would so prevail at last, that a time of godly *reformation*, and not a destruction, would ensue. Let me devote a page or two to proving this from his own words. I will begin with the Holy Scriptures, for at the Reformation there were few subjects of dispute so weighty.

Very thoughtful and beautiful are his words concerning that holy book written the year before he was made Chancellor:—

"It is, as a good holy Saint saith, so marvelously tinkered that a mouse may wade therein, and an elephant be drowned therein. For there is no

man so low but if he will seek his way with the staff of faith in his hand, and hold that fast and search the way therewith, and have the old holy fathers also for his guide, going on with a good purpose and a lowly heart, using reason and refusing no good learning, with calling on God for wisdom, grace, and help, that he may well keep his way and follow his good guides, then he shall never fall in peril, but will surely wade through, and come to such end of his journey as himself would well wish."

More tells us why he thinks some good men oppose the free circulation of the Holy Scriptures: because they feared the harm which bad men would do by perverting them. "Which fear," he adds, "causes me no fear; for according to the same principle, Christ should never have been born nor brought His faith into the world." "Nor I never yet heard any reasons laid why it were not convenient to have the Bible translated into the English tongue, yet when they were examined they might, in fact, for all that I can see, as well be laid against the holy writers that wrote the Scriptures in the Hebrew tongue, and against the blessed Evangelists that wrote the Scriptures in Greek." He is glad to hear that the King will move the Bishops in this matter: "among whom I have perceived some of the greatest and the best so well inclinable thereto already, that we lay-people shall in this matter, ere long time pass, except the fault be found in ourself, be well and fully satisfied and content."

A word, in the next place, of the King's Supremacy, on the one hand, and of the Papal Supremacy on the other. For if More recognized the Pope as *jure divino* head of all Christendom, the Romanists might have some ground, it must be confessed, for claiming him. On this cardinal question of the times, we, as American Churchmen, can now form unbiased judgment. For refusing to confess the King to be head of the Church, More, as we know, lost his life. Let us justify, if we can, those who not only submitted to the royal supremacy, as he also did, but who took an oath that in their hearts they thought it right, which he could not do. No doubt in due time the royal supremacy was so explained and limited, that the path of a right judging conscience became plain. But let us also remember that More understood the supremacy as the originators of the oath understood it; who, had they had their way, would long since have caused the Church to be lost in the state. Some proof of this I have already cited. Let me add Cranmer's own words:—

"All Christian kings have from God the whole care of all their subjects, as concerning the administering of God's word for the cure of souls, as for civil purposes; hence for both purposes, they must have ministers under them such as it shall please them to appoint. Princes and governors may make priests, and this appointing is sufficient for the purpose."

Let us thank God that in better days a more judicious and Scriptural mind prevailed over individual fancies, or rather let us trust that it was the Spirit of God. But where the right minded Christian layman, the conscientious and well instructed Churchman, would be found in such a question, Americans will now have little doubt. While, therefore, we honor More, the Christian hero, almost the saintly martyr, we may well believe that his blood did not stain the ground in vain.

The *Papacy* More undoubtedly accepted as a *fact*. He found the Pope the recognized head of Western Christendom, and so received him. And so were Luther and Melancthon, five years after More's death, willing to concede to the Pope a presidency over the other Bishops of Christendom, if faith and truth could have been preserved. But that, notwithstanding, More was no true Papist, his own words will show. He says, in his answer to Tyndal: —

"Never did he put the Pope for part of the definition of the Church. For he wist very well that the Church being proud, the common known Catholic congregation of all Christian nations, abiding together in one faith, neither fallen nor cut off, there might be made a question whether over all that Catholic Church, the Pope must needs be head and chief governor or chief shepherd; or else that the union of faith standing among them all, every province might have its own chief spiritual governor over it, without any recourse unto the Pope."

To this I will only add what he wrote to Cromwell in February, 1533. He declares that he sees advantage in the primacy of the Pope for the avoiding of schisms, but is content that the subject shall be submitted to a council of the whole Church, to which the King has appealed.

But, in the second place, More has often been accused of harsh words, and harsh deeds, even to *bigotry* and *persecution*, against those who differed from him. So far as these charges are true, I have no apology to offer for him. The cause of truth has never been advanced by personal attack on those who oppose it. They who cast dirt are sure to defile their own hands, while it is not certain that any will stick to their adversary. And we Americans,



happily free from a union of Church and State, may see that the State accomplishes little against such spiritual sins as heresy and schism, by inflicting the same penalties she imposes for theft, robbery, and murder. But again, we repeat that we must not imagine More transferred to our side of the Atlantic and to the year 1869, but must carry ourselves back, if we can, to his place and age.

That his words in controversy were sometimes harsh, and occasionally coarse, like those of his time, must be admitted. Neither would he deny it; men of all parties in that age used a bluntness, coarseness, and severity in argument which are now happily rare, except in political life, and among certain narrow controversialists. They had not learned the art of calling bad names in an elegant way. What they deemed error they hated with an earnestness we now might find it hard to realize, and if they hated a thing they said so, and called it what they thought it was. More, on one occasion, alludes to this. He is "a simple, plain body," he says, "who calls things by their right names. He can only call a horse a horse." They may rail against him as they will. "But surely their railing against all other, I purpose not to bear so patiently. Howbeit utterly to match them therein I neither can though I would, nor will though I could."

We freely grant that the harshness of many expressions is a blot upon his works. But it was certainly contrary to his spirit and his principles, both as a man and as a Christian. See, for example, how he speaks of Frith, one whom he opposed in controversy, and who lost his life, being condemned as a heretic. He had sent word to Frith, it was said, "I fear me that Christ will kindle a fire of fagots for you." But he afterwards wrote:—

"Now in these words, I neither meant nor mean that I would it were so. For, so help me God, and none otherwise, but as I would be glad to take more labor and loss, and bodily pain also, than peradventure many a man would ween, to win that young man to Christ, and to His true Faith again, and thereby to preserve and keep him from the loss and peril of soul and body both."

Let, then, his last holy and forgiving words atone, if they may, for the harsh words of controversy. Would that they were written on the hearts of all who are called to write in defense of the truth.

"Why should I hate any man? He whom I hate is either good or bad. If he be good, then am I naught to hate him. If he be bad, either

he will amend and so be saved, or else persevere in ill, and so everlastingly perish. If he shall be saved, why should I hate him whom eternally I must love? If he shall be damned, his pain shall be so great that rather we have cause to pity than to add affliction to affliction, in hating and cursing him."

Enough of More's harsh words. Who has not heard that he persecuted Protestants unto death? And no one who has not sifted the evidence can conceive how small a mole-hill has been converted into a great mountain. Again, we say, let us try to transfer ourselves to the age of Henry VIII. The statute of Henry IV. was revived in the first year of More's Chancellorship. It had long lain dormant in its horrible slumbers. This edict was passed not by Bishops, but by the Parliament, Lords and Commons. This statute made it the duty of all judges, sheriffs, etc., to see that no heretical preachings were permitted. Heretical teachers were to be arrested, and in not more than ten days delivered to the Bishop's court to be tried. If guilty they were to be punished, unless they recanted. If after recantation they relapsed into their former ways, they were to be delivered up to the secular power, and then the punishment was death at the stake.

More's unwilling acceptance of the Chancellorship, therefore, involved this thing: he took an oath to give all his power and diligence to assist the Bishops in destroying all manner of heresy and error. It plainly follows from the principles then recognized throughout Christendom, that heresy, as a sin against God, should be punished in like manner as treason, which was a sin against God's earthly representative, the King. We find, for example, the gentle Cranmer again and again taking under his charge the proceedings which brought honest and good men to the stake.

The young Edward VI., at a later day, had too much of natural tenderness in his heart to assent to such terrible punishments. But Cranmer urged, and almost forced him to sign the warrant for Joan Bocher's burning, which the youthful monarch did with tears, saying that Cranmer, not he, must answer for it before God. We find Latimer also preaching the usual sermon at Friar Forest's burning. The year after More's death, seven Charter House Monks and twelve Anabaptists suffered, almost at one time.

Truly to estimate the Lord Chancellor's course, therefore, the question should be, not whether any were condemned in his court, but whether, considering the time and the circumstances, his course

was that of a merciful and conscientious judge, inclining to mercy rather than to severity. And to that question, when we carefully sift the evidence on either side, we think we shall find but one answer. We will begin with his own words in the year 1528. For this true man never said in words more or less than he fulfilled in deeds : —

“The temporality would never have fallen so soon to force and violence against heretics, if the violent cruelty first used by the heretics themselves against good Catholic folk, had not driven good princes thereto for the preservation, not of the faith only, but also of the peace among their people.”

He had in mind, no doubt, the shocking barbarities of the Anabaptists in his own day in Germany, and the sacking of Rome, A. D. 1527, when 45,000 of all ages, sexes, and ranks, are said to have been murdered. But More proceeds to show that no sects nor heresies were punished in the early Church for centuries, except by spiritual penalties, and then he adds : —

“If all violence or compulsion were taken away from all sides, I little doubt but that the good seed sown among the people should as well come up, and be as strong to save itself as the cockle ; and God should always be stronger than the devil.” “I would that all the world were agreed to take away all violence and compulsion, upon all sides, and that no man were constrained to believe, but as he could be by grace, wisdom, and good works induced ; and then, he that will to God, go in God’s name ; and he that will to the devil, the devil go with him. There be many more to be won to Christ on that side, than to be lost from him on this side.”

“Now would to our Lord, son Roper, upon condition that three things were well established in Christendom, I were put into a sack and cast into the Thames.” “What great things be those, sir, that should move you so to wish ?” “Wouldst thou know, son Roper, what they be ?” “Yea, marry, with a good will, sir, if it please you.” “In faith, son, they be these : first, universal peace ; second, uniformity of Religion in the Church ; third, the matter of the King’s marriage, to the glory of God, and quietness of all parties, brought to a good conclusion.”

Roper, it may be observed, had become a Lutheran. And More, like Cranmer and others, at that period, was very much opposed to Luther’s teachings. For More said : —

“What good deed shall he study or labor to do, that believeth Luther, that he hath no free will of his own, by which he can, with help of grace, either work or pray ? Shall he not say to himself that he may sit still and let God alone ? What harm shall they care to forbear that believe

Luther, that God alone, without their will, worketh all the mischief that they do themselves?"

This was, no doubt, a partial misapprehension. But we must remember that to an observer in these days, the abominable iniquities of the Anabaptists might well present themselves as legitimate consequences of the extravagances into which Luther was led, at first awakening from dreams of error and superstition. More was, therefore, greatly troubled about his "son Roper's" opinions, and had many an argument with him, but all was of no avail.

"Henceforth," he said, "I will dispute with him no more; but one thing I can do, I will pray for him."

In this spirit the merciful Chancellor exercised his office. October 25th, 1529, he entered on its duties. One year and ten months passed without an appeal to the last resort against obstinate disobedience to the statutes of the realm. In August, 1531, the flames devoured poor Bilney. Diligent search will give us the names of three others who were probably condemned in the Chancellor's court. The next May, More resigned his office.

So little had he, in fact, to do with the persecution of heretics, that Erasmus, his warm friend, but an impartial witness, says that no one suffered at the stake through his means.

How, then, should such charges have originated and been circulated? Those were days when men believed strongly, felt strongly, talked strongly, and on all sides were not too scrupulous concerning the strict truth of what they reported, often on the merest hearsay evidence. Let one instance suffice: Foxe, in his "*Book of the Martyrs*," has collected a large number of such rumors, which he intermingles with historic truths, with little, if any, attempt at discrimination. He asserts, as a historic fact, though he had it from nothing but the merest rumor, and no evidence at all, that Burnham, one of the poor sufferers, was taken to More's house at Chelsea, that home of gentleness, which we have already visited, and whipped in the garden, at the "tree of truth," as it was called.

Happily, we have More's own words concerning this matter, and he never flinched from any act of his. After denying the whole thing he explains the rumor by what is manifestly the truth. Only two, he says, were ever punished under his direction, at Chelsea; the one a child, who certainly deserved all he got, and the other a lunatic, escaped from the gaol, whose naughty tricks were whipped

out of him by the parish constable, according to the discipline usual in those days. No other had even so much as a fillip on the forehead by his means.

One Constantine, accused of heresy, and put into the stocks, ran away. More only bade the porter mend the stocks, and lock them fast, lest he steal in again; "for never will I, for my part, be so unreasonable as to be angry with any man that riseth, if he can, when he findeth that he sitteth not at his ease."

One charge against More remains: his levity when he should have been serious. It is evident that he was not one of those who would deem piety to be connected with a sour demeanor, and a set of merely conventional expressions. How great this fault was, how much to be condemned in him, is a question to which we think one brief glance at his life will give the best answer. Let us dismiss the subject. We have seen, we trust, what More was not; a word now, in conclusion, as to what he was, in his outer and in his inner spiritual life.

As a Churchman, he conscientiously stood by his Church, which he sought to have reformed. God did not permit him to live long enough to see it so. Neither did he, nor perhaps any one in his day, foresee the manner in which it would, at length, be accomplished. The sky grew darker, the mighty waves rose higher and higher, until the very deep seemed broken up from its rocky recesses. Timid but thoughtful men like Erasmus, said, "I would join with Luther with all my heart, if I was sure he was with the Catholic Church. If things come to extremities, and the Church totters upon both sides, I will fix myself upon the solid rock, till a calm succeed, and I can see which is the Church."

But when the thunder had ceased to roll, and the waves subsided, or turned their fury into another course, the old Ark of Christ's Church, beaten by the storms of sixteen centuries, was still seen floating on, the hope of the nation, the consolation and safeguard of the faithful.

The Age of Henry VIII. was not the time when all this could be foreseen. And the course of a consistent Christian and Churchman could not then be as in the age of Elizabeth. But More was evidently feeling through the cloud and dust of strife for that Catholic way which the Church of England at length entered. "Let each reform himself," he says, and adds, with his own gentle spirit and Christian charity, which men of all parties would do well to copy:—

"So would I fain that every man would think, that there were but one man worthless in the whole world, and that one himself, and that he would therefore go about to mend that one, and thus would all wax well. And I dare boldly say, both they (Tyndal's party) and we should much the better amend, if we were so ready each to pray for the other, as we are ready to seek each other's reproach and rebuke."

But More's inner life is not hidden from us. The Holy Scriptures had been the guide of his youth when Colet was expounding them, and More was listening to them at St. Paul's. Erasmus' New Testament he had hailed with pleasure, and made his familiar companion. He had learned that "long rounds of ceremonies might prove a burden instead of wings to the soul."

"By how much the less thou trusted in private ceremonies, so much the more will they be useful. For then, at last, will God esteem thee faithful servant, when thou countest thyself good for nothing."

Amid all the contentions of Christendom in his day, he finds one great and glorious foundation on which all Christian men might come together. It is that on which he had firmly planted his own feet; "that the God-man was born, and suffered and died for our redemption, and that we were redeemed to Heaven by His Blood, and that without Him we should never have been saved, but should utterly have lost Heaven." We would that contentious Protestants in these days had more of his spirit. He was not like the author of the "Christian Hero," one day following the world, the flesh, and the devil, and the next day inditing sentiments of penitence and devotion. And, therefore, we may refer to his words, knowing that his life of piety, charity, and holiness, corresponded with them.

Not all the engrossing affairs of court, political trusts, or foreign embassies, made him forget the heavenly life. It was in 1522, that the Privy Councilor and under Treasurer of England, commenced his treatise "*de novissimis*" on the Four Last Things: "a bitter wholesome medicine," he says, "for any man is the remembrance of these:" the strong affections of the earth, and the weak ones which bind us to heaven, may both be changed.

But it is in the days of adversity that the faith or secret unbelief of the heart is laid open. In such days, More had no need of Saint or Angel as his dependence. It is not the Blessed Virgin Mother who is invoked for help in the darkness of his spirit, in the mortal agonies of his body; it is that Mother's Divine Son. With



the strong cry of human weakness and fear, blending with the firm voice of faith and a good conscience, he calls on One who agonized in soul, and died also.

During these long, painful months of suffering in prison, which brought his already diseased body down to death's door, there were no new principles to be sought for; the old faith was sufficient to the end. "My firm hope is that he who so dearly bought me, will not without mine own damnable fault, leave me to his most malicious enemy."

He spent the weary days of imprisonment in devotion and writing devotional treatises, to be a comfort and guide to others. Among them are "A Dialogue of Comfort against Tribulation," and a "Treatise on Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament." He began a treatise on "The Passion of Christ," but pens, ink, and paper were taken away, and it was never finished. Enough remains to show a Christian man's trust in Christ only. "The means of man's redemption," he says, "is the sacrifice of Christ obediently offered on the Cross to the Father, and that no man shall be saved without Faith, St. Paul declareth."

He, in the days of prosperity, had never entered upon any great duty without first kneeling in Chelsea Church, to receive the Sacrament of his Lord's Body and Blood; now he shows how great is the grace to be looked for in it, but he says that the means whereby that grace is received, is Faith. And he adds this devout prayer:—

"Most dear Saviour Christ, who, after the finishing of the old Paschal sacrifice, didst institute the new Sacrament of thy most blessed Body and Blood for a memorial of Thy bitter Passion, give us such true faith therein, and such fervent devotion thereto, that our souls may take fruitful ghostly food thereby."

He is no stoic, going with a proud, hard heart through all troubles; seeing all, fearing, even weeping, with deepest self-distrust and true humility, but looking to his Master, he will bear the Cross after Him, hoping to be with him in endless peace.

Very touching are his words in one of the last letters to Margaret, as the horrible tragedy is reaching its consummation:—

"Mistrust Him, Meg, I will not, though I feel me faint. Yea, and though I should feel my fear at point to overthrow me too, yet shall I remember how St. Peter, with a blast of wind, began to sink for his faint faith, and shall do as he did, call upon Christ, and pray Him to help. And then I trust He shall set His holy Hand unto me, and in the stormy seas

hold me up from drowning. Yea, and if he suffer me to play St. Peter further, and to fall to the ground, and swear and forswear too, which our Lord for His tender Passion keep me from, and let me lose, if it so fall, and never win thereby; yet afterwards shall I trust that His goodness will cast upon me His tender, piteous Eye, as He did upon St. Peter, and make me stand up again, and confess the truth afresh, and abide the shame and the harm here of mine own fault. And, therefore, mine own good daughter, never trouble thy mind for anything that ever shall happen to me in this world. Nothing can come but that God wills; and I make me very sure that whatsoever that be, seem it never so bad in sight, it shall indeed be the best. And finally, Meg, this wote I well, that without my fault, He will not let me be lost. I shall, therefore, with good hope, commit myself unto Him, and if He suffer me, for my fault, to perish, yet shall I then serve for a praise of His justice."

It is a thing hardly to be found elsewhere in the world's history; a man high in station, and busied with the affairs of nations, laying bare, in all the tender confidences of such private letters as More's to "Meg," such depths of humility and Christian devotion. And, besides, it is a thing worth learning, that, amid the strife of parties, truth may flee away to hide itself in some few thoughtful hearts, who shall one day prove to have been, under God, her only guardian, till calmer skies invite her to fly abroad again. Such days were those of Henry VIII., in the great questions which for us the English Reformation has happily set at rest.

On the thirtieth of April, 1533, Anne Boleyn was to be crowned with the crown of a pure wife cast off, widowed in that frightful widowhood of broken vows. More was invited to join the procession. His honorable poverty being known, a small sum of money was sent to him for the purchase of a new gown.

He was not so discourteous as to refuse the small gift; they who sent it knew he had refused the £4,000 which they with others of the Convocation had voted to him before, but he would not be present at the consummation of what he considered abominable iniquity. He held his peace. But that silence spoke more loudly than any words. From such a procession More's absence was like that absence of the busts of Brutus and Cassius at Junia's funeral. "The busts of twenty noble families were there, but most notable," says Tacitus, "were Cassius and Brutus, because their images were absent."

There were those at court, therefore, who were on the watch to find some occasion for an accusation against him. And the "Holy

Maid of Kent's" wild prophecies seemed to furnish the occasion. Elizabeth Barton had been a nun in a convent at Canterbury. She was subject to epileptic fits, a disease so mysterious that it was popularly deemed a special visitation of God's Providence. Her incoherent ravings were heard by the common people with the greatest reverence; and she very naturally learned to think much of them herself.

As was very natural, also, in those days, for one in her situation, she turned to prophesying about the King, and even ventured to denounce God's wrath on the realm and its ruler, for his crime in divorcing her who was deemed to be his lawful wife. More had inquired into the matter. The "Holy Maid of Kent" had also consulted Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and even, it is said, went, at his advice, to the King himself. When More chanced to meet the nun herself, he had, with his usual shrewdness, avoided committing himself to any of her revelations.

In Parliament, then, a bill was introduced attainting of *misprision*, i. e., of concealment of treason, Fisher and others, among whom More was included. He had written to Cromwell concerning the matter, some time during the previous year, and hence there was not much uncertainty with regard to his innocence. When, therefore, he appeared before the Commission which had been appointed, the true foundation of the whole was laid bare. Of the misprision of treason, the tyrant's tools had not a word to say. It was the King's marriage, and the expressive silence of the man who dared to have a conscience of his own, which disturbed them so greatly. They promised him the King's good will, if he would go with the Parliament, the Bishops, and the Universities. More hoped to have heard nothing more of that matter, as it was well understood that he had nothing to say, either for or against it.

Then they proceeded to threaten him for having provoked the King to maintain the Pope's authority, in the book which Henry had published against Luther, by which he had "put a sword in the Pope's hand to fight against himself." More's reply was, that he did only arrange the book after it was finished, by consent of the makers; and that he advised the King to omit his assertion of the Divine right of the Papal supremacy.

"A King's wrath is cruel," was the warning they gave him.

"My Lords, these terrors be arguments for children, not for men," was his calm reply.

"By the mass, Master More," said the Duke of Norfolk, "it is perilous striving with princes; therefore I would wish you somewhat to incline to the King's pleasure, for the wrath of a King is death."

"Is that all?" tranquilly replied More, "then, in good faith, the only difference between your grace and me, is but this: that I shall die to-day, and you to-morrow."

In such times, only a single heart, direct and pure of purpose, can be light. More sailed merrily from that polluted world to his dear home at Chelsea. His son-in-law, his only companion, was glad, for surely his father had been acquitted. But yet, to make more sure, as they two walked in the garden — "I trust, sir, that all is well, because you be so merry?"

"It is, indeed, son Roper, I thank God."

"Are you then, sir, put out of the bill for attainder of treason?"

"By my troth, I never remembered it."

"Never remembered it! A case that toucheth yourself so near, and us all for your sake! I am sorry to hear it, for when I saw you so merry, I verily trusted that all had been well."

"Wilt thou know, then, son Roper, why I was so merry?"

"That would I gladly, sir." And why could he forget his attainder of treason, and danger of his life? It was because human weakness and fear had yielded to the martyr's spirit, that could smile at death.

"In good faith, son, I rejoiced that I had given the devil such a foul fall; and that with these Lords I had gone so far that, without great shame, I could never go back again."

Report of the conference was made to the King, and the Commissioners advised that More's name should be left out of the roll. He would appear before the House of Lords, and his manifest innocence might ruin the whole bill.

The King, it is said, was very angry, but yielded to earnest and reiterated requests, and the promise that another and better occasion for proceeding against More would soon be found. His name was struck out of the bill. But these were only the first mutterings of the coming storm. There was hardly a gleam of sunshine before it burst upon his head with deadly fury.

In the month of January, 1534, Parliament had passed the act of the royal succession. If any person, by writing, printing, or by any exterior act or deed, procured or did anything to the prejudice,

slander, or derogation of Queen Anne, or her issue by the King, so as to interrupt their title to the crown, such offense should be high treason. And if any person should publish, or utter anything to the peril of the King, or slander of the marriage with Queen Anne, or to the slander or disherison of the issue of that marriage, it was made misprision of treason. All persons of full age were to take an oath to fulfill and maintain the objects of the act; and those who refused to take such oath, when required, were to be held guilty of misprision of treason.

No form of oath was prescribed by this statute, so the Chancellor and Secretary Cromwell prepared one more stringent than the requirements of the act itself. It prohibited men from having a conscience of their own. For they must swear not only submission to the act of succession, but that the wife of twenty years had been unfaithful. Lords, Bishops, Abbots, Commons, all swore, though many had affirmed to the contrary, not long before. How they smothered the voice of conscience, is not for us now to inquire.

There was one man, at least, who could do no such thing. And to him, the first layman called, came the summons, only two weeks after his previous dismissal, April 13th, 1534, to go and do battle for the rights of conscience, and of man. To those loving hearts whose sorrows were his bitterest draught, he could not say farewell. He never before had taken his leave of them, but that they followed him, with loving leave-takings, down to his boat. But now he could not bear that, for he was not so hard or stoical as not to feel what it is to leave life and all those for whose sake life is worth having.

"I know few so faint-hearted as myself," he had said. So he stole away with one companion. But was not One stronger than he, standing by him and strengthening him? That morning, as on all other momentous occasions, he had sought his strong Helper, at the altar of Chelsea Church. "Light sorrows speak; great griefs are dumb." He was a long time silent, but when he looked up, the light within beamed from his clear eyes, and with firm voice he whispered to his son-in-law, "I thank our Lord, the field is won." And it was true. We shall follow our hero to a battle bloodless, save with his own blood; but we shall see him gather up the fruits of his victory till he go in triumph to lasting peace. A joyful reaper, he enters into his Master's heavenly garner, bearing good sheaves, sheaves whose seed he had sown with many tears.

No one could doubt More's obedience, and he was willing to take, at Lambeth Palace, an oath proving that. A true patriot, he was ready to submit to the law.

"As for the law of the land," he said, "though every man is bounden to the keeping, in every case, upon some temporal pain, and, in many cases, upon pain of God's displeasure too, *yet is there no man bounden to swear that the law is well made, nor bounden, upon pain of God's displeasure, to perform any such parts of the law as were indeed unlawful.*"

His silence spoke too powerfully; the example of such a man had too much weight; and Herod and Herodias would have him speak, or the just man's life should be the penalty. He could only say one thing: "I never intend, God being my good Lord, to pin my soul at another man's back, for I know not whether he may happen to carry it."

He therefore asked to see the oath required, and the act of succession. After carefully examining them, he said that he would swear to maintain the succession, but could not take the proffered oath. He would not say why he refused, for the King would be displeased enough without his doing that; but, with the King's license, he would give his reasons in writing. Cranmer then suggested to him a curious problem in casuistry: "Of this course of conduct you are not sure that it is right; but you are sure that you ought to obey the King." More replied that he did not know how to answer an Archbishop concerning such a question in morals. "But see," it was added, "how many Lords, Commons, and others, are against you in this." "If I were alone," he replied, "I would surely be afraid to lean to my own mind. But a large part of Christendom is with me."

For such a man, at such a time, the only place was the Tower. Little but life remained to him. His few and small possessions he had divided among his children before the time of trial came. They were wrested from them. His house was searched for anything worth robbing. And pleasantly he wrote to Margaret, not long after, when a piece of coal was his only pen, — the one consolation of a man of letters, his pen and paper being denied to him, — that "to search his poor house would only make game for the searchers, unless they should find his wife's gay girdle and gold beads."

Books were taken away as well as ink and paper; with great



difficulty even the favor of a friend's presence was gained. It was a month before Margaret saw him. There still remains on record Lady More's letter to Secretary Cromwell, which states that, paying fifteen shillings weekly for her husband's and his servant's board in that cell of the Tower, she had been obliged to sell some of her own clothing, for lack of other substance to make money.

Some persons have found grave cause of objection to More for the playful words his peaceful heart could utter. If it were shown that he, like many, jested with grave and holy things, we would ourselves object as strongly. But he seems to us to speak as an unquiet conscience could not, and a hard heart would not, great words for great things, and light words for little things. To the keeper of the Tower, offering, perhaps, some apology: "I verily believe you would entertain me with your best, and whensoever I mislike my cheer, then thrust me out of doors."

But those tender letters wherein human sympathies and weaknesses blend so touchingly with the spirit of the hero and martyr, — we know nothing like them anywhere else. They may be read and read again, until fancy transport us to that damp, cold cell, and show us that gray headed man grown old before his time, and bent with trouble and disease, inditing with pieces of coal and scraps of paper his messages of love and heroism. Almost buoyant cheerfulness alternates with Christian trust, and the highest aspirations of one whose martyr crown is near.

Margaret is now a hero's child, rewarding him for all his long continued care of her. Now, on one scrap of paper, he remembers all at Chelsea in his prayers, even to their maids and men servants, their husbands, and, as he pleasantly adds, "your husbands' shrewd wives, and your father's shrewd wife, also." And again, Margaret's letter misunderstood, she seems to him to be urging him to take the oath; like Eve, she "presents him the apple." Nothing pained him so much as that. And again, "a deadly grief and much more deadly than to hear of mine own death, is that I perceive you in great displeasure and danger of great harm thereat," *i. e.*, through his proposal to take the oath; "God help you." But Margaret's answer sets his mind at rest, and shows him where comfort had been found in that desolate house — "in the experience we have had of your life past, and godly conversation, and wholesome counsel, and virtuous example."

Before all worldly things, Margaret would fain be in John A.

Wood's place, who waits on her father. "The world is not so precious as the letters which show the rest of his soul in God, worthy to be written in letters of gold." She prays no more for his deliverance, but "only for Jesus' help for him, never to decline from His blessed Will, but to live and die His obedient servant."

Again More's old poetic spirit returns, and the thoughts of his heart, while the fire of adversity is daily burning out their dross, thus shape themselves in words:—

"Eye-flattering fortune, look thou ne'er so fair,  
Or ne'er so pleasantly begin to smile,  
As though thou wouldst my ruin all repair,  
During my life thou shalt not me beguile.  
Trust shall I still in God, to enter in awhile  
His haven of Heaven sure and uniform:  
Ever after thy calm I look but for a storm."

Poor, suffering, yet strong in faith and love, how he and Margaret try to comfort one another! "Good Father, strengthen my frailty with your devout prayers." "A threefold cord between us is Christian charity, and natural love, and your very daughterly feeling." "The Father of Heaven must strengthen thy frailty, and the frailty of thy frail father too." "A fainter heart than your frail father hath, canst thou not have. I am by nature so shrinking from pain that I am almost afraid of a fillip." This was his natural disposition, and now painful disease, aggravated by his damp cell, was wearing out heart and spirit, and pressing him down into his grave. All the greater, then, is the triumph of Christian resolution and the grace of Christ, overcoming even such obstacles as these.

Such truth and singleness of heart are set in even brighter light by contrast with worldly double-mindedness, and calculating selfishness. Such a contrast More's wife affords. After a long time she got permission to see him. She could not know what to make of such a man.

"He who was always reputed wise, was so playing the fool as to be content to be shut up in a close and filthy prison, where she felt as if she could not breathe, with rats and mice, when he might be enjoying his liberty and the King's favor, if he would but do as all the lords and other learned men had done. He had a good house to live in, his library, his gallery, his garden, his orchard, and all other necessities handsome about him, where he might enjoy himself with his wife and children. She could not conceive what he meant by tarrying so long in that prison."

Such arguments admitted of but one answer : —

"I pray thee, good mistress Alice, tell me one thing; is not this house as nigh heaven as mine own?" "If I should be seven years under ground, and should then come back to my house, I should not fail to find some in it who would bid me get out of doors, and tell me the house were none of mine."

More's wife, at such a time, would doubtless have the multitude on her side. Lady Alice Allington, More's step-daughter, went to Chancellor Audley, during the summer, in order to intercede with him in her father's behalf. "He understood," he said, "that More was not doing as every one else except the blind Bishop." And he told her, with bursts of laughter at his own wit, the merry story of the lion, the wolf, and the ass, who went to confession.

In the world outside of that peaceful cell, things were hastening to their crisis. In November, 1534, Parliament decreed that the King was supreme head of the Church, with "full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, etc., all such errors, heresies, abuses, etc., whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual authority or jurisdiction* ought, or may lawfully be reformed, repressed," etc. And this statute meant, according to the mind of those who decreed it, and his mind who had the interpretation of it in his own power, that Henry's dominion, as in God's place, was over both soul and body, with full authority to give and recall all spiritual powers and jurisdiction, and to decree concerning the Christian faith, what should be believed, on peril of both body and soul.

This act, it seems, imposed no penalties. Henry, therefore, had another added to it, that whosoever should maliciously wish or desire to deprive the King of any of his titles, should suffer as a traitor.

More was already dead to the State, in prison for life, and bereft of all his goods. Dead to the world, also; he spoke to no one, not even to Margaret, of the new question of the supremacy. But the world could not yet forget the wise, the good, the merciful, and the just man, whose praise had been in the mouths of all Europe. More's clear vision had foreseen all this, and weighed it all.

"Now have I heard since that some say that this obstinate manner of mine, in still refusing the oath, shall peradventure force and drive the King's grace to make a further law for me. I cast in my mind that peril.

I found myself very sensual, and my flesh much more shrinking from pain and from death, than methought it is the place of a faithful Christian man. Yet I thank our Lord that in that conflict, the spirit had in conclusion the mastery; and reason, with help of faith, finally concluded that it is a case in which a man may lose his head, and yet have no harm."

So his triumphant faith humbly and yet joyfully exclaimed: —

"I put my trust in God, and in the merits of His bitter Passion. And I cannot but trust that whoso longeth to be with Him, shall be welcome to Him. Pray for me, Margaret. I pray for you when I would be very sorry, but if I thought you were asleep."

His forebodings were soon realized. Even a man who neither said nor did anything against the King's supremacy, and who was already, by attainder of misprision of treason, dead in the eye of the law, could be reached by the King's commission, for it exercised almost unlimited powers. April 30th, 1535, occurred an interview of which More shortly after wrote an account to Margaret.

The Lieutenant of the Tower summoned him to go out into the gallery to meet Secretary Cromwell. He shifted his gown and went out, meeting many known and unknown to him. Then he went into a chamber, where were Cromwell, the King's attorney, the solicitor Rich, and others. He was requested to seat himself, but declined doing so.

The Secretary said, "You have seen the new statutes?"

"Yea, but I did not examine them."

Had he not read the first, of the King's being head of the Church, etc.? The King's pleasure was to demand of him his opinion, and what his mind was therein. He answered that he had from time to time declared his mind to his Highness, and to the Secretary. Now he had discharged his mind of such matters, and neither talked, read, nor wrote concerning them; and neither would dispute the King's title nor the Pope's. Cromwell said that he thought that that was "an answer which would not be satisfactory to the King. The King was of a pitiful disposition, and would be glad to see submission and to show mercy."

More only answered that he would not meddle with the world again, if it were all given to him. Sickness had done its work with him.

"My whole study shall be upon the Passion of Christ, and my own passage out of this world. I give no man occasion to hold any point one way

or other. I am the King's true, faithful subject, and daily pray for him. I do nobody any harm ; I say no harm ; I think no harm ; but wish everybody good. And if this is not enough to keep a man alive, in good faith, I long not to live. And I am dying already ; and I have, since I came here, been divers times in the case that I thought to die within an hour. And I thank our Lord I was never sorry for it, but rather sorry when I saw the pain past. And, therefore, my poor body is at the King's pleasure. Would to God my death might do him good."

The Secretary said that though a prisoner, condemned to perpetual imprisonment, he was not thereby discharged of his allegiance. "Your demeanor makes others so stiff." But finding that they could make nothing of him, the Commission sent him back to his cell. Once more the same scene was rehearsed. Archbishop Cranmer, Chancellor Audley, and Secretary Cromwell came to the Tower. They rehearsed what had been said before, and added that the King was not satisfied.

He could make no other answer, for the King himself had taught him to look first to God, and then to him. But he added that though he might have pain in consequence, he could not have harm ; for "a man may in such a case lose his head," he often said, "and yet have no harm."

Very characteristic of the man is the little anecdote which belongs to some one of those long, weary days of waiting in prison for the end to come. A weak, silly courtier is conversing with him, and begs him to change his mind. Discussions would be useless ; arguments would be thrown away. So More replies briefly that he has changed it already. The courtier hastens to convey the good news to the King, but returns to the prison to learn that whereas More had "intended to be shaved, that he might appear to the people as he was wont to do before his imprisonment, he was now fully resolved that his beard should share the same fate with his head."

And so this man of spotless life, this ornament of his age, against whom even malice could find nothing, was indicted of high treason at the court which his venerable father had adorned for so many years. Slowly, with trembling steps, leaning on his staff, in the premature old age brought on by labors for others, and ill usage from those whom he had served during the fourteen months in which he had laid in that cell, he walked the long journey from one side of London to the other, from the Tower to Westminster Hall.

His gown, coarse and worn ; his hair white with sorrows ; his face pallid and emaciated, though serene and calm ; only his gray eye, unchanged, shone with the light which filled his soul. So he went to the mock tribunal. Too feeble to stand up, he asked permission to seat himself. The charges were read. Then the Chancellor and the Duke of Norfolk addressed him, hoping he would now change from his obstinacy. " Thanks, my Lords ; but I pray God to keep me in the same mind until death."

First, the moving spring of all, was the charge that he had opposed the King's marriage. But it would ill have become him, he said, as an honest man, trusted with highest responsibilities by the King, to conceal his opinion when the King required it of him. But for that fault he had lost, except life itself, all that he could lose ; honor, liberty, and property.

Next, of the King's supremacy, and the Parliament's last statute concerning it. He had refused to say anything, and could not be punished for silence, but only for a crime said or done. Silence gave consent, and his mind he had never opened to any one.

The second head in the charges was that he had written maliciously to Fisher, then in prison with him. He replied that his letters were about private matters, not upon the subjects in question. But the letters had all been burnt, and could not, therefore, be produced as testimony.

The third head was, that he and Fisher had both said that the statute was a two-edged sword. And the agreement in their language, proved conspiracy between them. He answered, " I said, if such is the edict, how, in avoiding one edge, will one escape the other ? "

It is evident that very little could be made of such a charge. How, then, to form the indictments ? Then was seen such a sight as English courts have rarely beheld ; such a monstrous mockery of justice that the noble man who has occupied More's seat in our day, always calm and judicious in all his expressions, is compelled to say, in writing the lives of his predecessors, " It was the blackest crime that has ever been perpetrated in England, under the forms of law." No witness could be found. So Rich, the King's solicitor, left his place of prosecutor, to give testimony — at once witness, prosecutor, and judge. And, by perjury, he attempted to prove some word or act within the reach of the statute, which More had again and again declared that he had not gained, and would not gainsay in word or deed.



Rich had come to the Tower to take away More's books, and had tried to draw from him some committal of himself, some breach of the statute.

A gamester and a liar, whom his own associates neither respected nor trusted, was it likely, More said, that he would say to him what he had never uttered to better men? Rich called to the stand his assistants in the cell. But they had been busy with the books, and had heard nothing. More's searching rebuke withered him, as a hot blast shrivels a leaf: —

"If I were a man, my Lords, who regarded not an oath, ye know well I needed not stand now at this bar. And if the oath which you, Mr. Rich, have just taken is true, then I pray I may never see God in the face. In good truth, Mr. Rich, I am more sorry for your perjuries, than for my peril. You and I once dwelt long together in one parish: your manner of life and conversation from your youth up were familiar to me, and it paineth me to tell, you were ever held very light of your tongue, a great dicer and gamester, and not of any commendable fame, either there or in the Temple, the Inn to which ye have belonged. Is it credible, therefore, to your Lordships, that the secrets of my conscience touching the oath, which I never would reveal, after the statute once made, either to the King's grace himself, or to any of you, my honorable Lords, I should have thus lightly blurted out in private parley with Mr. Rich?"

Forms of justice, however, mattered little. Men that trembled for their own necks needed no time to deliberate upon a verdict already prepared for them. It had a semblance of decency to wait a quarter of an hour: then the judge hastened to give sentence. But at such a trial, it was rather the prisoner who was sitting in judgment upon his judges.

"When I sat upon the bench," he meekly and calmly said, "the manner in such a case was, to ask the prisoner, before judgment, whether he could say *why* judgment should not be given against him." Such a quiet rebuke could abash, for an instant, even such a judge, but not long enough to hinder rude and frequent interruptions: "Are you, then, wiser than all the Bishops, nobles, and the realm?" Or again, almost ere another sentence issued from the prisoner's mouth: "Now, More, you show your maliciousness." And, meanwhile, what was the prisoner trying to say? Simply what we American Churchmen have been taught, and have believed from our childhood: —

"Now will I speak my mind, that after seven years' study I have never found that laymen could be head of the spiritual or ecclesiastical order.

I have all Christendom with me in this." "I speak not in maliciousness, but in necessity of exonerating my own conscience. Neither does it escape me that I am condemned for being unwilling to assent to the King's new nuptials."

And, no doubt, he spoke the truth. Herodias would have his head. But with that prophetic insight into the ways of God which marks the pure of heart, he had said to Margaret when in his cell: "Alas! Meg, alas! it pitieth me to remember into what misery she will shortly come. These dances of hers will prove such dances that she will spurn our heads as foot-balls; but it will not be long ere her head will dance the like dance."

A few more words of heavenly wisdom, which surely He that had long dwelt in His faithful servant taught him to say, and he bade adieu to the evil world, ready to pass out of its darkness into perfect light:—

"I have nothing more to say, my Lords, but that like as the blessed Apostle St. Paul was present and consented unto the death of Stephen, and kept their clothing who stoned him to death, and yet be they now both holy Saints in heaven, and shall continue there friends forever, so I verily trust, and shall therefore pray, that though your Lordships have now been my judges on earth, to my condemnation, we may yet hereafter all meet in heaven to our everlasting salvation. And so I pray God preserve you all, and especially my Sovereign Lord the King, and send him faithful counselors."

It will be found, in some reports of this trial, that More, at the last, professed his belief in the Papal supremacy. It may, indeed, have been so. But when we consider that concerning a question which then caused so much fierce debate and bloodshed, we can have only the reports of those who related to Roper what they heard, very partial witnesses whether on one side or the other, we think we shall do well to rest with those well considered words of More himself, which he calmly committed to paper, and which will be found in a previous part of this Article. This is not the place to reconsider the subject. We can only say that we know of nothing in More's last days to disprove our previous assertions, that More died in that faith which is most dear to American Churchmen.

So back to the Tower again, the axe-edge toward his neck, grim halberdiers around him; amazement and horror in the hearts of the widow and the orphan; gaping wonder in the crowd. His only son, outside the Hall, fell at his father's feet. The poor old man

raised him up, kissed him, and gave him his farewell blessing. One scene more on that pitiful journey ; the world has seldom had its like. Even coarse and stern soldiers were weeping almost before they knew what they were doing. "A tender woman, young, modest, beautiful, educated and learned as a companion of sages, pressed through the crowd at the Tower wharf, through those soldiers, and fell at his feet in speechless sorrow, her bitter grief finding vent only in tears."

Poor, old man — glorious Christian hero — such an one is no stoic. At that lamentable cry which at length burst forth, "My father ! O, my father !" tears which the rack could not have forced out, flowed abundantly for her.

Margaret tore herself away. But ere she had gone a dozen steps, again, in that bitterness of heart which knows no fear and no restraint, she turned and clasped him in a long embrace.

And then, at length, her father found words: "Be patient, Meg, 'tis God's will ; long ago you knew my heart's secrets." So kissing her, he entered that low, darkly frowning archway, from which he came forth again only to die.

Though that blood, sprinkled on the ground, must have called down a curse on those who shed it, and checked Europe's hopes of a pure Religion and a true reformation, yet it speaks in trumpet tones of encouragement to those who dare to live and die for a good cause, even alone.

We shall be rewarded by trying to decipher the last words which the coal and scrap of paper have left us : —

"Our Lord bless you, good daughter, and your good husband, and your little boys, and all yours, and all my children, and all my godchildren, and all my friends. Remember me, when you may, to my good daughter Cicely, whom I beseech our Lord to comfort. And I send her my blessing, and to all her children, and pray her to pray for me. I send her a handkerchief. God comfort my good son, her husband. My good daughter Daunce hath the picture in parchment that you delivered me from my Lady Conyers ; her name is on the back of it. Show her that I heartily pray her that you may send it in my name to her again, for a token from me to pray for me. I like special well Dorothy Coles. I pray you be good to her. [She was a servant of Margaret's, and went with her to the Tower wharf.] Be good to my good daughter Joan Aleyn too. [She was another servant.] Give her, I pray you, some kind answer ; for she sent hither to me, this day, to pray you be good to her. I cumber you, good Margaret, much. But I would be sorry it should be

longer than to-morrow. For it is St. Thomas' Eve, and the Utis of St. Peter; and, therefore, to-morrow long I to go to God. It were a day very sweet and convenient for me.

"I never liked your manner better than when you kissed me last, for I love when daughterly love and dear charity have no leisure to look to worldly courtesy.

"Farewell, my dear child, and pray for me, and I shall for you and all our dear friends, that we may merrily meet in heaven. I thank you for your great cost. I send now my good daughter Clement [his adopted orphan] her algorisme stone [used in reckoning]. I send her and my godson, and all hers, God's blessing and mine. I pray you, at time convenient, recommend me to my good son John More. I liked well his natural fashion [kneeling down for his father's blessing at the return from the trial]. Our Lord bless him and his good wife, my loving daughter, to whom I pray him to be good, as he hath great cause; and that, in the land of mine come to his hands, he break not my will concerning his sister Daunce; and our Lord bless Thomas and Austin, and all that they shall have."

The previous night had been passed in quiet sleep. The morning brought Sir Thomas Pope to tell him that he must suffer before nine that morning.

"I am much bounden to the King," said More, "for the benefits and honors he has bestowed upon me; and so help me God, most of all am I bounden to him that it pleaseth his Majesty to rid me so shortly out of the miseries of this present world, and therefore will I not fail earnestly to pray for his grace, both here, and also in the world to come."

"The King's pleasure is further," said Pope, "that at your execution you shall not use many words."

"Master Pope," said he, "you do me well to give me warning of his grace's pleasure, for otherwise, at that time had I purposed somewhat to have spoken; but of no matter wherewith his grace, or any other, should have had cause to be offended. Nevertheless, whatsoever I intended, I am ready obediently to conform myself to his grace's commandments; and I beseech you, good Master Pope, to be a means to his highness that my daughter Margaret may be at my burial."

"The King is content already," said Master Pope, "that your wife, children, and other friends, shall have liberty to be present thereat."

"Oh, how much beholden, then," said Sir Thomas More, "am I unto his grace, that unto my poor burial vouchsafeth to have so gracious consideration."

So Pope was leaving him in tears. "Quiet yourself, good Master Pope, and be not discomforted, for I trust that we shall once in heaven

see each other full merrily, where we shall be sure to live and love together, in joyful bliss eternally."

He would have arrayed himself in his best, wishing to do the executioner, he said, a service, who would *do him* that day so singular a benefit. "Nay, I assure you, were it cloth of gold, I should think it well bestowed on him, as St. Cyprian did, who gave his executioner thirty pieces of gold."

The Lieutenant, however, induced him to put on a plainer suit. But he sent the man a gold angel in compensation, "as a token that he maliced him nothing, but rather loved him heartily."

At nine o'clock on the sixth of July, 1535, he was led out of the Tower; his beard long, his face pale and lean, carrying in his hands a red cross, casting his eyes often towards heaven.

So he went cheerfully to death, on Tower Hill, with pleasant words as of old, concerning little things, but with the heart stayed on the one strong staff of the living and the dying.

When told that the King had commuted his sentence of hanging, drawing, and quartering, for simple decapitation, he said, "God preserve all my friends from such royal favors." Or again, removing his beard out of the executioner's way: "My beard has never committed any treason."

But of his faith and hope he desired to speak from the bridge to the assembled crowd. The sheriff, however, begged him not to proceed, perhaps fearing the consequences, and More contented himself with asking their prayers, and desiring them to bear witness that he died in the faith of the Holy Catholic Church, and a faithful servant of God and the King. Kneeling, he repeated the Miserere. When he rose from his knees the executioner begged his forgiveness. More kissed him and added, "Thou art doing me the greatest benefit that I can receive. Pluck up thy spirit, man, and be not afraid to do thine office. My neck is very short; take heed, therefore, that thou strike not awry, for saving of thine honesty." The executioner offered to cover his eyes: "I will cover them myself," he said, and binding them with a cloth which he had brought with him, he knelt and laid his head upon the block.

But evil doers tremble even when their full purpose is accomplished. When "Glamis hath murdered sleep," then "Macbeth shall sleep no more." Simple hearted people believe that Bishop Fisher's head smiles upon them, where it is fastened to the bridge. So for fear the good Chancellor's gray hair, clotted with blood,

move them more, one of the biographers relates, and the story may be true, that More's head was mutilated after death. Well might they fear lest looking down on the poor, whom he had relieved, the widow and the orphan, whom he had succored, who come and stand beneath, and look up and whisper together, it speak from its pale lips in voiceless eloquence, and make the trembling herd cry out against their rulers, and startle the sensual monarch from his dreams st.

Fourteen days the great and good man's head hung there on the Tower bridge, in its mangled ghastliness; then Margaret took it, her one treasure in life, in death to rest in that bosom, near that heart which once beat in such love and reverence for her father.

But Margaret grieved not alone. Nor those who looked mournfully at that once lovely home in Chelsea, now desolate, and in strangers' hands. For the ignorant, the poor, and those who had been in trouble or sorrow, mourned as for a father or a brother departed. Nor Englishmen alone. For good men of all nations had found a friend in More. "I, myself, have seen the tears of many," wrote Erasmus, "who have never seen him, nor received a favor from him." Nor this alone. All Europe felt the shock of such deeds of horror; and those in France, or Spain, or Italy, who had looked with hope for a united Christendom, sadly resigned all hope.

And that blood-stained King, whose sun, once rising so gloriously, was now beginning to go down in red, murky clouds, ere it had reached its noon, knew that he had murdered the innocent. We have his implied confession that so it was. It may, or may not be true that, conscience-stricken, he endeavored to throw the blame upon Anne Boleyn, sternly looking at her when the tidings of More's execution were brought to him, and saying, "Thou art the cause of this man's death," and leaving her to her own reflections, while he withdrew to the gloomy solitude of his own chamber, followed by images of terror and remorse. But, at least, it is certain that he dared not leave the facts to speak for themselves. Feeling the shock which made Europe tremble, he was driven to justify himself by manifest lies. Those poor people who had known what More was, were now, by Henry's order, to be taught by the magistrates what we know, and Henry knew to be from first to last a falsehood — that he, so scrupulously submissive, had endeavored to disseminate sedition.



To Francis, Henry excused himself by saying that he could not have banished the man, since he would have been working out conspiracy abroad. And this of More, whom he had known so many years, as his familiar friend, knowing that his only wish was to spend his few and feeble days in peace and preparation for his near approaching end.

To the Pope, also, Henry sent another long tissue of falsehoods. We have them among the state papers in Cromwell's instructions to Casali, September, 1535. He wonders that the Pope is so much offended, and enters into long explanations. Though responsible to no one but God, yet lest by calumnies his royal name be traduced, the King "writes the facts." After the realm was at peace concerning the new marriage, these men began to disturb it. The King had hoped better things of them, but they abused his clemency after Parliament had settled the matter. They sought out pretexts for misleading the people. Their own handwriting and confessions betrayed them. Then they were thrown into prison, for he could not do otherwise. But they were treated humanely and kindly; were allowed to enjoy the society of friends; had servants and their accustomed food and clothing, as their relatives desired.

Parliament, its action assented to by the whole kingdom, had passed necessary statutes. They, pretending to be occupied in devotions, had tried to mislead all they could. Testimonies of this remained; manuscripts in coal and chalk, etc.

Enough of this. What American Churchman will doubt that a true and gentle man, a hero Christian, a firm and right-judging Churchman, ended, by a martyr's death, a confessor's life, when More's blood sprinkled the scaffold? When the world's great heart, that mighty pendulum whose beats mark centuries, was swaying from the extreme of man's invented traditions, and unchristian trusts in man's merits, to the other extreme of bold and unbridled rationalism and license, that spared nothing venerable, nothing holy, nothing divinely given to remain perpetually till Time's end; when men were tamely submitting heart, soul, will, and conscience, meekly putting them all under a lascivious tyrant's foot; in such times it is a glorious sight to see one who would purify and save, instead of destroying, whose example speaks so impressively to us Americans, in these days.

It is a glorious sight to see one who, without fanaticism or licen-

tiousness, dares to confess to a tyrant, or a tyrant mob, that he has a soul, a conscience, and a faith. It is a help to us in life's work to know one who knew how far submission to man is a duty to God, and when that point was reached, with no factious or seditious spirit, dared to die. Looking back at him, we may well blush at our own indifference to the holy cause for which he lived and died. It is a small thing that American Churchmen should lay their poor chaplets on his mangled body. We see, too, how a man of true heart, singleness of purpose, and firm Christian faith, may find his way along dark and slippery paths, when the multitude are erring to their infinite loss. We indeed look back, and create in our mind distinctions of which the reign of Henry VIII. knew little or nothing. We try to classify men as Romanist or Protestant, as if the lines were as clearly defined as at a later day. But not so then. There was Lutheranism arising in one quarter, not free from extravagances which repelled many of the best men whom the English Church possessed, and which led More to say, "What good deed can a man study or labor to do, who believeth with Luther that he has no free will of his own?" There was the Anabaptist fanaticism, overthrowing society, religion, and morality together. There was the Papal party, adhering blindly to any superstition and error. And there was Erastianism, misleading such good and distinguished men as Cranmer, inducing them to forget that God had not given Religion into Cæsar's hands, nor made His Church a department of the state for a licentious monarch to mould to his will, profanely attempting to create what God could only make or destroy. And through all this the friend of reformation, desiring to see God's work revived, and fearing lest he should see that holy work destroyed, might well miss his true path, since he could scarcely see which way his steps were tending, and must lean only on the Arm of the Invisible One. It is an inspiring sight to behold a man in such days led along by the aid of the One Rod and Staff, and finding his way to Eternal Rest.

This, also, we may learn from More's life. It is a comfortable lesson. To be a true man, requires not great genius, or talents, or learning. More was excellent in many things. He did not hold the highest rank in any. But his symmetric virtue and consistent manliness are traits of which we have no need now to write. And they make him a safer example for us to follow than many others

of greater genius, more abundant talents, and more extensive and profound acquirements.

The true man is not free from errors. We have seen, we think, that More was not. But his faults were those of the generous spirit and pure conscience, not those of the self-seeking and the time-server.

It is with difficulties such as no one can appreciate who has not tried to pursue independent historic research, when many most needed and original documents are not to be had, that even such a sketch as this is, can be written. But let us trust that however imperfect or superficial it may be, American Churchmen will receive more cordially to their hearts the remembrance of one whose life was given to their own Holy Mother, and, with Her, to the one Redeemer of us all. In our catalogue of the great and good, let us reserve one chief place for this true and gentle man, this zealous and pure-minded Churchman, this Christian hero, Sir Thomas More.

---

#### BOOK NOTICES.

GRAFFITI D'ITALIA. By W. W. STORY. Charles Scribner & Co., New York, and Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1868.

Mr. Story is known as the son of a distinguished jurist, as an artist, and as the author of "Roba di Roma." We have had no opportunity of measuring his merit in the fascinating domain of sculpture. The work last named is a minute and admirable sketch of the "Eternal City" in its modern aspects — sprightly, graphic, and, in many respects, unequaled. Every description is a picture. You see the ceremonies of Rome. You see the beggars of Rome. You see the gamblers of Rome. You see the pageants of Rome. You see Rome as she is in all her poverty, her superstition, and her splendor. When Mr. Story would pencil a scene from antiquity, the crowded Coliseum stands before you in its majestic proportions. Beasts paw, and glare, and roar. The people yell. Vestals appear in their glittering white. Knights sit in their chairs. Senators advance with dignity. The Emperor ascends his throne in his purple. The vast edifice resounds with the cries of animals, the clash of combatants, the applause of spectators. Where the scene is not described it is suggested, and fancy makes a picture more vivid than the pen. The characteristics of Mr. Story's prose are perceived in his poetry. He is essentially dramatic. He evinces the eye of an artist. He exhibits a passion for the beautiful. If his style is sometimes prosaic, his thoughts are never trivial. While seldom soaring to the loftiest regions of poetic excellence, he rarely sinks into a mere mediocrity. His verse is usually musical, although occasionally careless, and even imperfect. We should expect a man of his age, evidently conversant with the world, to excel most in wit, and least in passion. It is just the

reverse. His wit is often tame, and his passion is always intense. He reserves his fire for scenes of love, which burn with flames rather of an Italian than an American sun. While this book exhibits very high merit, and may, perhaps, take permanent rank in our literature, it yet frequently is seen to be rather the production of the artist laboring in his studio than the poet talking with the universe. It is also painful to observe that there is, we think, not even an allusion to the author's own country. We can understand that the home of the artist may be amid the works of the immortal European masters. We can understand that the "Eternal City" is to genius an inspiration. We can understand how crude, and bare, and youthful must seem art in our own Republic, to one familiar with the gardens, the galleries, the edifices of the old world; but we *cannot* understand how Mr. Story, historically connected with his country, should be so wholly occupied with classic subjects and Italian scenes, as to have no incidental allusion to the bright promise of his native land. We should have expected some ray from this Western glory to have kindled in his song. He resembles a beautiful flower transplanted to a foreign soil, where new juices and another sun increase the brilliance of its hues, and yet make us sigh for its native colors. This book of Mr. Story has indeed no nationality. He has lost one country, and not found another. He is not American, and he is not Italian. On a trunk too vigorous to be changed by transplantation, we have a bright exotic bloom.

We will conclude with an extract expressing a familiar thought in an original manner, and more strikingly than we have ever seen it in any other author:—

"So does the complement, the hint, the germ  
Of every art within the other lie,  
And in their inner essence all unite.  
For what is melody but fluid form,  
Or form but fixed and stationed melody?  
Colors are but the silent chords of light,  
Touched by the painter into tone, and key,  
And harmonized in every changeful hue.  
So colors live in sound—the trumpet blows  
Its scarlet, and the flute its tender blue;  
The perfect statue in its pale repose  
Has for the soul a melody divine,  
That lingers dreaming round each subtle tone."

The strength of Mr. Story is in what pertains to the theories and representations of art. His heart is more in his marble than his verse.

**CHINA AND THE CHINESE:** a General Description of the Country and its Inhabitants, its Civilization and Form of Government, its Religious and Social Institutions, its Intercourse with other Nations, and its Present Condition and Prospects. By the Rev. JOHN L. NEVIUS, Ten Years a Missionary in China, with a Map and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

The Celestial Empire has an equal interest for the statesman, the scholar, and the Christian. The former beholds a vast territory, equal in extent to the organized States of our own Republic, and with its eighteen provinces added, having an area twice as large as all our united possessions—exclusive of Alaska—crowded with nearly half the population of the globe, cultivated

by an industrious people, possessing exhaustless agricultural and mineral resources, boasting men of admirable learning, making education an indispensable condition of office, exhibiting a venerable form of government, whose period contrasts with that of our own as the duration of an Egyptian pyramid with the age of an American villa; and whose twenty-five hundred years of life are not yet entombed by the earthquake of a gigantic revolution. Let the locomotive thunder along the streams and over the plains of China, from Peking as a centre to the distant provinces, and link the antiquated civilization of Asia to the progressive civilization of Europe! Let the telegraph girdle this mighty empire! Let all its resources of soil and brain be opened to our world! The revolution of thought and habit which will succeed appears stupendous and unrivaled. Asia will eventually pour a stream of wealth on our Pacific coast, large and ceaseless, as that discharged from Europe on our Atlantic coast, and San Francisco will be the magnificent rival of New York. The celestial, now ridiculed for his pigtail and his idol, will yet be a merchant prince in America.

Omitting the attraction for the scholar in the ancient, the complex, the marvelous language of China, how the heart of the Christian pulsates as he views it in connection with the Cross! Perhaps never has the development of the religious instinct been more clearly traced than in this singular empire. The system of Confucius was a pure humanitarianism, with no trace of a God. Its centre was veneration for the parent, not worship of the Deity. It had no eternal sanctions. It was the Mosaic Law mutilated, teaching duty to man, but not to his Creator. It secured for Confucius a tomb, a temple, veneration, immortality. Yet, while embraced and admired by the universal empire, we find the instincts of the nation unsatisfied by a mere moral system — reaching out after God as a dungeon-plant towards the sun, and enthroning for worship the monstrous idols of Buddhism, and the multiplied deities of Taoism. How glorious, how satisfying, how divine in the comparison appears our own holy religion — embracing both tables of the Law, offering pardon through the Cross of our Saviour, an example in his Life, and immortality in his Resurrection! The soul of every Christian must glow in anticipation of its future triumph over the dark and terrible superstitions of the Chinese Empire.

The work of Mr. Nevius is the result of a long residence in the interesting country he describes. He has been a careful and minute observer, and seems faithful in his record of facts. He seizes strongly on whatever is characteristic in the past and present of China, and in a simple, unpretending, graphic way presents his readers with a vast amount of practical information which can scarcely be found in any other volume. In a book of such modest merit, we will not take time to notice minor blemishes.

HER MAJESTY'S TOWER. By WILLIAM HEPWORTH DIXON. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

Scarcely an edifice in Europe concentrates in itself so much history as the great Tower of London. Every turret has a voice! Every wall has a lesson! Every apartment has a life! Almost every stone has a national interest! The venerable pile towers like a rock amid the surges of an ocean, looking down in silent majesty as generation after generation sweeps noisily about its base. Gundulf the keeper, and Henry the builder — a secluded Norman monk and a mighty English monarch — were its first designers. It

united the quiet meditation of the cell and the treasured wealth of a throne. Here Ralph of Durham, the devouring lion, lavished his forced contributions. Here Richard the Second yielded his crown. Here Henry the Sixth died, most probably by violence. Here the Hunchback murdered his youthful nephews. Here Margaret of Salisbury met her tragic fate. Here Richmond moved in royal state. Here Oldcastle died a martyr. Here Fisher awoke on the morning which saw his blood stain the scaffold. Here Lady Jane Grey was imprisoned before she passed to a crown whose title will never be questioned. Here Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley knelt, in prayerful preparation for the martyr's fire. Here the majestic Raleigh heated his crucibles, and wrote his books, and conversed with his friends, and elaborated his theories, before the axe severed from its trunk that head enshrining the brightest intellect of England. But we must pause in our record. What future histories lie in Her Majesty's Tower! How long will its walls protect a crown which is to encircle the brows of British monarchs? Shall it stand a witness of coming revolutions, which are to shake the throne of England, separate the Church from the state, and convert the kingdom into a republic? These questions we cannot answer. But we can say that Mr. Dixon has used the old Tower to good advantage in making a new book. It is full of interesting facts, but shows everywhere unmistakable traces of a volume manufactured for the market. Many familiar historic truths are introduced to swell its size and increase the price.

**TRAVEL AND ADVENTURE IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA**, formerly Russian America, now ceded to the United States, and in various other Parts of the North Pacific. By FREDERICK WHYMPER. With Map and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

This book is written by an Englishman, and, without the common conceit of vulgar travellers from Albion, is full of good nature, sense, observation, and information.

Alaska is, of course, a name which has found its way in one fashion or another out of the Senate Chamber, where the treaty with our Russian friends was ratified. We are among those who wonder what the country is, and whether there are whale oil, or seal, or fur, or coal, or timber enough in our new and not everywhere prized dominions, to help us pay our taxes and to raise the national debt from America. Mr. Whympers is evidently a young man, and hopeful, and speaks of Alaska kindly; but it still appears in the honesty of his book, though this region *may* have coal for our Pacific steamships, and timber too, and *perhaps* gold in some of those gullies which reach back among its ice-mountains, and fish are plenty, it is yet a land of long winters and short summers, where it rains oftener than it shines, with great rugged chains of mountains extending perhaps to the Frozen Sea, and vast shaggy forests, not overstocked with game, and with a population of mean and low Indians, and where neither trade nor agriculture can ever very much prosper.

Mr. Whympers is what we may call a promiscuous traveller. Wherever there is a new place to explore, accessible to man, he goes, not so much for money, or the chase, as to discover something new, in that enterprising spirit which has belted the world about with Englishmen on their travels. He therefore explored in his own rollicking, wayward fashion, British Columbia and the Russian possessions on the Asiatic coast of the northernmost waters. Part of



the time he seems to have been officially connected with a telegraph company which undertook to connect Europe and America, by way of Northern Asia, and whose attempt the success of the Atlantic Cable has brought to naught. He wintered in a trading fort; lived among the natives; watched Alaska and Russian manners with a careful eye; sketched down the quaint things he saw with a dash of humor and English self-complacency to give them a pronounced coloring, and ended by writing a very clever book. It has not the eloquence of Kinglake's "Eothen," nor the elegance of the "Cross and Crescent" — is not eloquent or elegant at all; yet it is a sensible, humorous, plainly pictured, lively, charming book, and scattered about in it are many bits of rare information.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. By H. P. LIDDON, M. A., etc. Third Edition Revised. Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1869. Published in the United States through Scribner, Welford, & Co., 654 Broadway, N. Y.

We often think when writing these curt reviews of voluminous or valuable books, that they should be called "Book Glimpses" instead of "Book Notices." Here, for instance, are thirteen elaborate and profound sermons, on the vast themes of God in His relations to humanity, by an apt and matured scholar, with time to meditate, and scholastic libraries all around him to invigorate and broaden his thought, and we give him perhaps ten lines in notice. Yet whoever does himself the favor to buy these sermons, will find in them the truly pious and patristic spirit of our ancient faith, and a bold defense of the Christian Mysteries against the new moods and skepticism of this age, which too often believes only what it sees, as if the very idea of Faith did not for ever deny the supremacy of the universality of sight. We shall merely remark one thing in this brief reference to a very creditable and valuable contribution to Anglican sermons, for which all persons who believe that scholarship is the friend of Churchmanship, will thank their author. When we ordinarily turn from American theological works of this date to English, we find a certain patience, calmness, rest, and thoroughness in the latter which are wanting in the former. These sermons have about them that air of venerable ancientness, whose daughter is not Fire or Fever, but Rest. They seem to belong to a Church whose stones are draped with venerable mosses and many rooted ivies, and under whose aisles are the crypts of long lines of revered prelates, who ministered before those unwasting altars upon which the Holy Eucharist is daily laid by the hands of new priests, and whose life and genius are toned to a great calmness by the silent tides of the ages flowing down, without hindrance, from the beginning. They are sermons to be written within the silent retreat of an English college, by an English priest, who taught by the old, undertakes to control the new, and not always friendly, thought of English university men, to the childlike obedience of the faith of Jesus Christ.

CAST UP BY THE SEA. By SIR SAMUEL W. BAKER, M. A., F. R. G. S., etc., with Ten Illustrations by Huard. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

Those of us who have followed with delight Sir Samuel, an unknightsd traveller, as he told us in his charming African narratives of as stubborn a struggle as man ever made against savages, sickness, and the very hostility of

Nature herself, when he discovered the Nile in those recesses of reedy marsh and muddy lakes, where he had hid his secrets for thirty centuries from the wit and search of man, hardly expected to meet our explorer as a writer of books for boys. Yet "Cast up by the Sea" is a boy's book, and judging from the very emphatic praises showered upon it by two juveniles, who have well nigh worn out its covers reading what lay between them, as well as our own more cursory survey, it is a very successful attempt to interest and instruct the young. The thread of the story is the life of a young boy, Edward Grey, cast up by the sea in shipwreck on the English coast, and reared by the kind-hearted country folk who saved him. This lad in a surprising course of fortune, which led him into almost every quarter of the globe — an impressed seaman, an officer, a prisoner; left to die in the African desert, come back to England; tried for his life in a conspiracy that failed; shown at last to be the true son of the very judge that tries him; happily married and prosperous to the end — exemplifies how God takes care of a faithful and honest soul, and can bring good out of evil. The bad characters in the book teach suitable ethics, and although it is perhaps a trifle too sensational, it is lively, instructive, and it gives its verdicts always on the right side. The illustrations of the book are full of spirit, and all boys will like it.

**THE LAW OF LOVE, AND LOVE AS A LAW; or, Moral Science, Theoretical and Practical.** By MARK HOPKINS, D. D., LL. D., President of Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

This somewhat novel and alliterative title covers much reflection on mental problems which lie behind all science and civilizations. Dr. Hopkins is a Christian of the Puritan order, and his book has a flavor of those Scotch metaphysics which have so colored the Calvinistic New England mind. Most people will not be able to weigh all the author's conclusions, and they concern, indeed, matters about which it seems that men are fated to disagree. There is, however, a pure atmosphere of high morals about Dr. Hopkins' book, and an evident desire to advance the interests of religion, and it will no doubt prove a useful manual for those college classes for whom it seems to have been prepared. Its ability will hardly be called in question.

**THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.** By AMOS DEAN, LL. D. In seven volumes. Vol. II. Albany, N. Y.: Joel Munsell. 1869.

This second volume of Prof. Dean's laborious work fulfills the promise of the first. It is devoted through its seven chapters to a discussion of the history, industry, religion, society, government, philosophy, and art of Greece. Of course a book of some five hundred pages, which undertakes such extensive subjects, must have more or less the air of a compendium about it, such as this volume exhibits. What there is to be said about Hellenic history, Grote has taught us in his ponderous judicial, exhaustive, and, we will add, exhausting volumes. What men have to say of Greek philosophy, Lewes and the Germans tell us. Of Greek art tongues have never ceased to speak, nor pens to write; and of Hellenic nationality as a whole, the ablest intellects have meditated at least since the Christian era. Greece is everywhere — in our Gospels and Epistles, in our Fathers, and, in short, in every philosophical system of Christendom. She affects our thought, art, life. It is not possible, then, for Prof. Dean to dig down very far among the roots of his subject, nor

to discuss before us the reasons for his conclusions. His is not a metaphysical, nor an analytical, nor even a subtle mind. He is not in any way a Platonist; but rather an Aristotelian — and one of the two every man of mind is — and he tells us a plain, honest, learned story of outside phenomena, divested of speculation and conjecture, so that the facts he offers are tangible, and of immediate value to one who needs for his professional use something out of Greece. For instance, he tells us that the lovely plateau on which the Parthenon and so much sculptured and templed majesty stood, was only about eight hundred feet long by some four hundred wide. Professor Dean is not an eloquent or a subtle writer; but he is an honest and interesting one, and his second volume has a value in it for all who love Grecian learning or nationality.

**PRE-HISTORIC NATIONS; or, Inquiries concerning some of the Great Peoples and Civilizations of Antiquity, and their Probable Relation to a still Older Civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia.** By JOHN D. BALDWIN, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1869.

This is a very singular book. Its topics may be discussed, but never settled, and it resembles as much as anything "an attempt at the probable history of the human race." It boldly reaches back into the beginnings of races, and delves among the roots of history which lie under the mould of ages of which there is hardly any record. Mr. Baldwin, who, as we learn from his preface, is a member of the American Oriental Society, is of that volatile genius which gives a bold opinion about the use of the magnetic needle among the Phœnicians, the locality of the Ophir of Scripture, the origin of the Chaldean Empire, the nativity of the Celts, the writings of Irish Bards, the possible origin of the North Carolina Tuscarora Indians, and the geologic age of the world, and all with a very courageous faith in his own conclusions. His literary temper appears in his comment on Montesquieu's saying: "Il y a des choses que tout le monde dit, parce qu'elles ont été dites un fois." "Instead of repeating anything 'because it has been said once' it is better to accept the results of conscientious investigation." This book has much quaint learning (measured by our American standard), and is very readable; and for a man with fixed religious ideas, and unable to consult a large library for information on recondite and fascinating questions of ancient history, it has a very positive value.

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES.** By HARRIET MARTINEAU. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869.

We confess to having taken up this book with a prejudice against its author for her recent and singular vagaries in certain social and ethical matters, well known to the literary world on both sides of the Atlantic. This fact may, perhaps, defend the sincerity of our praise, when we say we laid it down with a sense of having gained from Miss Martineau's volume a great and rare profit. The "Sketches" originally appeared in the "London Daily News" as obituaries of the distinguished personages named therein, and are now put into permanent form for the perusal of the reading public. They are forty-six in number, and the celebrities discussed are classed as "Literary," "Scientific," "Professional," "Social," "Political," and "Royal." The names are of both men and women, and all of them of such intellectual or moral weight as to have

accomplished somehow a work which affects the course and color of English civilization. It may be added that most of them flourished either during the close of the last century or in the first half of the nineteenth.

For the rest, as we see them in court, camp, study, drawing-room, and laboratory, we discover them to be the incarnated history of their times. This book has a real value to two classes of persons — to those familiar with these great personages before Miss Martineau wrote of them, and to those almost ignorant of them. The first will see their old acquaintances often put on new traits of character, and be clad in new robes of honor, as they appear attired under the hand of so historic a costumer as our authoress. Take, for instance, Alexander Von Humboldt, whom almost everybody knows. Miss Martineau, in a general and approving survey of his scientific labors, points out with great accuracy that weak point in him, namely, his too profound obeisance to kings, and other great but sometimes stupid people, in his role as courtier; how, for instance, when he came to London in the train of the King of Prussia to the christening of the Prince of Wales, he, the first king in knowledge in all the world, wearing a crown that can never fade so long as man shall admire great thoughts or works, had, like a very lacquey, to ask his master's permission before he could go out to dine with his English brothers in science; and then how, when the Czar had begged him as a loan from Prussia to examine Siberia scientifically, he hurried over that ancient and mysterious province, so full of geologic wonders, and came back in nine months to wait, forsooth, by the king's chair whole years, while science and the world may wait five hundred years for a man as great as Humboldt was to tell them of the Czar's Iceland in Asia. Unread and young people will find in these "Sketches" tidings of many great lives for them to emulate, and of some worldly lives for them to shun. Especially should this book be read either by persons beginning to study the nineteenth century literature of England or by those who have read it faithfully, since it will urge on the curiosity of one class, and it will be sure to modify the judgments of the other. We wish to say that here is a potent, wise, judicious, fresh, charming book, worth any man's reading: and when we read in its pages again of Christopher North's wayward, Titanic, warmly generous nature and love of Scottish highlands; or of Lockhart's sarcasm, and Croker's sardonic and libelous criticisms on poor Whig authors; or of Macaulay's mendacious and constitutionally false rejoinders to men who did not hold his politics; or of Miss Opie's literary triumphs in her stupid town of Norwich; or of De Quincy's opium, or Hallam's sorrow; or the great, solemn, life-long sacrifice and silence of Lady Byron, under a cross to wound into agony a sensitive woman's nature, such as hers was, we see the whole legend of modern English literature in all its shame and glory passing before our judgment, and we thank the writer.

In the political and kingly world, too, Miss Martineau is full of interest. Her story of the Napiers, her friendly analysis of Palmerston, that fair-faced youth who began public life with such maidenly modesty of mien, but came to show in it the jauntiest, sauciest, pluckiest temper of any English statesman; her kind memorial of Joseph Hume, her more reserved praise of Harry Brougham, her stern judgment of Nicholas the Russian, and of Metternich, her romance, almost, of the Dutchess of Kent, are such as to lay under a debt of gratitude every man who reads them. We have praised this book because it deserves it; and we say it on our honor, that we believe every man will be glad after he has bought and read it.

ITALY, FLORENCE, AND VENICE, from the French of H. Taine. By J. DURAND. Leypoldt & Holt, New York. 1869.

M. Taine is the author of a work styled the "History of English Literature," which develops one of the wildest philosophical theories ever yet suggested. It applies to letters the principle Buckle employs in politics. It makes the unfolding of genius like the growth of a tree, or of an animal. It subjects intellect to circumstances, as the Stoic enslaved man to fate, but without attributing to a human soul that heroic energy which dignified the philosophy of the Porch. It professes that, given certain data, such as climate, scenery, lineage, temperament, together with the peculiarities of race and age, it can absolutely predict that a certain genius will arise, and express certain thoughts in a certain way. Nothing is left to the freedom of fancy, to the fire of passion, to the originality of reason, to the energy of will — to that spontaneity and divine creative power which sometimes seem almost to control circumstances, and change the course of history, and form new eras for our world, and which, next to holiness, exalt man nearest to the image of the Deity. While this species of materialism has its root in human vanity, it has its fruit in human degradation. Denying God, and immortality, and accountability, it makes the soul a machine in movement, and a worm in destiny. But if M. Taine has shown himself in his former work a weakling in philosophy, he has in the present volume proved himself a master in description. His realm is Art and Poetry, not Science and Theology. He as much excels in sentiment and imagination as he fails in logic and induction. He glows and revels amid scenes of beauty. He exhibits as much of the French genius in his descriptions of a picture, or a statue, or an edifice, as Michelet in his delineations of a lark, or a nightingale, or a condor. How exquisite the following contrast: —

"Compare the 'Mercury' of John of Bologna with the young Greek athlete near him. The former, springing on his toe is a *tour de force* which is to do honor to the artiste, and prove an attractive spectacle to fix the eyes of visitors. The young Athenian, on the contrary, who says nothing, who does nothing, who is contented to live, is an effigy of the city, a monument of its Olympic victories, an example for all the youths of its gymnasia: he is of service to education as the statue of a god is of service to religion. Neither the god nor the athlete need be interesting; it suffices for them to be perfect and tranquil; they are not objects of luxury, but instruments of public welfare; they are commemorative objects, and not pieces of furniture. People respect and profit by them; they do not use them for their diversion nor as material for criticism."

How beautiful the statue of Niobe is made in the succeeding extract to express the sad and solemn experiences of our humanity!

"The eyes, again turning upward, rest on the four structures of ancient Pisa, solitary on a spot where the grass grows, and on the pallid lustre of the marbles profiled against the divine azure. What ruins, and what a cemetery is history! What human pulsations of which no other trace is left but a form imprinted on a fragment of stone! What indifference in the smile of the placid firmament, and what cruel beauty in that luminous cupola, stretched, in turn, like a common funeral dais over the generations that have fallen! We read similar ideas in books, and, in the pride of youth, we have considered them as rhetoric; but when man has lived the half of his career, and, turning in upon himself, he reckons up how many of his ambitions he has subdued, how much he has wrung out of his hopes, and all the dead that lie buried in his heart, the sternness and magnificence of nature appear to him as one, and the heavy sobbing of inward grief forces him to recognize a higher lamentation, that of the human tragedy which, century after century, has

buried so many combatants in one common grave. He stops, feeling on his head as upon that of those gone before, the hand of inexorable powers, and he comprehends his destiny. This humanity, of which he is a member, is figured in the Niobe at Florence. Around her, her sons and her daughters, all those she loves, fall incessantly under the arrows of invisible archers. One of them is cast down on his back, and his breast, transpierced, is throbbing; another, still living, stretches his powerless hands up to the celestial murderers; the youngest conceals his head under his mother's robe. She, meanwhile, stern and fixed, stands hopeless, her eyes raised to heaven, contemplating with admiration and horror the dazzling and deadly nimbus, the outstretched arms, the merciless arrows, and the implacable serenity of the gods."

We will conclude with a description which exhibits all the wonderful wealth of M. Taine's genius, remarking that its glow, its spontaneity, its originality, are the strongest arguments against M. Taine's philosophy.

"The cathedral, at the first sight, is bewildering. Gothic art, transported entire into Italy at the close of the Middle Ages, attains at once its triumph and its extravagance. Never had it been seen so pointed, so highly embroidered, so complex, so overcharged, so strongly resembling a piece of jewelry; and as, instead of coarse and lifeless stone, it here takes for its material the beautiful lustrous Italian marble, it becomes a pure chased gem as precious through its substance as through the labor bestowed on it. The whole church seems to be a colossal and magnificent crystallization, so splendidly do its forest of spires, its intersections of mouldings, its population of statues, its fringes of fretted, hollowed, embroidered, and open marblework, ascend in multiple and interminable bright forms against the pure blue sky. Truly it is the mystic candelabra of visions and legends, with a hundred thousand branches bristling and overflowing with sorrowing thorns and ecstatic roses, with angels, virgins, and martyrs upon every flower and on every thorn, with infinite myriads of the triumphant Church springing from the ground pyramidically even into the azure, with its millions of blended and vibrating voices mounting upward in a single shout, hosannah! Moved by such sentiments we quickly comprehend why architecture violated the ordinary conditions of matter and of its endurance. It no longer has an end of its own; little does it care whether it be a solid or a fragile construction; it is not a shelter but an expression; it does not concern itself with present fragility nor with the restorations of the future; it is born of a sublime frenzy and constitutes a sublime frenzy; so much the worse for the stone that disintegrates and for generations that are to commence the work anew. The object is to manifest an intense revery and a unique transport; a certain moment in life is worth all the rest of life put together. The mystic philosophers of the early centuries sacrificed everything to the hope of once or twice transcending, in the course of so many long years, the limits of human existence, and of being translated for an instant up to the ineffable One, the source of the universe."

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE; comprising Masterpieces in Poetry and Prose, marking the Successive Stages of its Growth, and a Methodical Exposition of the Governing Principles and General Forms, both of the Language and Literature; with Copious Notes on the Selections, Glossary, and Chronology, designed for Systematic Study. By HENRY N. DAY, Author of "Logic," "Art of Composition," "Rhetorical Praxis," etc., etc. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. 12mo.

The descriptive title of this work obviates the necessity of an analysis, and it therefore only remains to speak of the manner in which the task has been executed. We might perhaps excuse ourselves from this labor also, by referring to the well-known author's previous works, as a guaranty for this last effort; yet it is due to him to say that his plan is one that must commend itself to the student of English Literature, while its execution is eminently



satisfactory. He has made neither a biographical sketch-book, nor a history of authorship, but rather an assistant to such as desire to penetrate to the very foundations of the English tongue. He does this by gradually unfolding its growth, as illustrated by the best specimens of the successive periods, taking for this purpose not mere scraps, but, when practicable, entire monographs.

If we mistake not, the author puts his work forward in favor of that movement now progressing, and which aims to reduce, somewhat, the attention paid to the dead languages, or, at least to secure a better attendance upon the study of our living speech. The latter object will be greatly advanced by works like this now under consideration. Few things will be found more edifying to one who earnestly desires to study his mother tongue than the notes to the extracts from early versions of the Bible, Piers Ploughman, and Chaucer. We must observe, however, that while the illustrative portions from the best writers are usually selected with admirable judgment, the copious extracts from Longfellow's "*Hiawatha*" might possibly have been spared.

**TRUTH AND COUNTER TRUTH.** By the Rev. THOMAS RICHEY, D. D.  
New York: Pott & Amery. 1869.

This little work of one hundred and eighteen pages, contains eleven short essays on important theological subjects, of very general interest to all classes of Churchmen. The book will nevertheless be found most useful to those who are not very far advanced in theological studies, and who are troubled by such truths and counter truths as the omnipotence of God and the freedom of man, and the divine and the human, as exhibited in Christ the God-man. The style of the author is clear, and the discussion animated. We are glad to commend the book to favorable consideration.

**THE POETICAL WORKS OF CHARLES G. HALPINE** (Miles O'Reilly), with a Biographical Sketch and Explanatory Notes. Edited by ROBERT B. ROOSEVELT. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

The author of the above work was the son of a clergyman of the Irish Church. Graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, with honor, he afterwards studied medicine, but abandoned the profession to engage in journalism, which the family of the Halpines had always found a congenial pursuit. Failing to advance himself in the old country, he sought a home in the new, where eventually he won considerable reputation, as well in political and military, as in literary circles. His poetical works give us a fair exhibition of the man, whose life was spent in dealing with the issues which hourly press themselves upon the attention of a metropolitan journalist. We may therefore readily judge of the character of his poetical effusions, a large proportion of which were thrown off in haste for a special purpose and for political effect, but having now burned out their fire they are of little more interest than the remains of last year's rocket. Still there are some pieces that will never lose their attraction with the lovers of beautiful song. Among this class we may include the opening piece, entitled a "*Vesper Hymn*," which breathes a deep Christian faith and reveals a chastened spirit, relying on an all-sufficient Christ; and yet we are astonished to find that the relation of the poem to what follows is that of a cross-crowned porch prefixed to a temple of Bacchus. As we proceed the tone is suddenly changed, and we are surprised to find notes of revelry bursting upon the ear, and constantly gathering force, until they

rise and swell in a deafening roar. Then, when the debauch is finally over, with the last clink of the wine glass, the curtain rises upon scenes of political strife, and Miles O'Reilly appears with a Philippic in rhyme, to sway some disorderly rabble, or neatly round some political job. In fact he is a man of all work, and yet, when he gets a brief vacation from what we should, on the whole, hesitate to characterize as his heavy Bohemian round, he takes us kindly by the hand, and leads us away from Lamb's "sweet security of the streets," as he called it (for the sake of the alliteration, let us hope), carrying us off to the sea-shore, within sound of summer waves, falling with a gentle splash upon shining sands; or out through shady lanes, green, daisy-sprinkled fields, by prattling brooks, and among grand old trees, where, with a peculiar grace, he discourses of all that is beautiful and pure, and delights our eye with a rapid succession of pictures and sketches drawn with naturalness and ease.

The transformations of character in this volume of verse are very sudden, but they finally come to be not altogether unexpected. In fact, Mr. Halpine was one of the most versatile writers who has ever appeared among the literary men of New York. He seems equally at home in every department, and yet we would fain believe that the first piece in the volume, already alluded to, shows more of his real character than those unseemly effusions written for not over good publications, that merit nothing less than the severest condemnation. And yet we would deal out the censure with a gentle hand, for the grass is now growing over Miles O'Reilly's grave, in which lies a heart that beat warmly for every friend and was never ungenerous to a foe. This volume betrays his worst and best characteristics, and if it proves that at times he spoke with levity of sacred themes, and was often too tolerant of wrong, yet it was a lasting pleasure for him to strike a blow for the right. Therefore, while we have no sympathy with those features of the book at which we have faintly hinted, and disavow all friendship for his mischievous theory, which seems to teach that moral obliquity is a sort of correlative or complement of large mental growth, we freely acknowledge his strength and versatility as a writer of verse, that glows not unfrequently with true poetic fire.

FISHING IN AMERICAN WATERS. By GENIO C. SCOTT. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

The author of this volume tells us that the experience of many years has led him through so many scenes of beauty and pleasure, that he now desires all the world may learn something of the enjoyment conferred by the art of angling. He therefore endeavors to exhibit the sport enjoyed by an American angler, to describe the tackle used, the progress of fish culture, and to give illustrations of all the varied and kindred themes. In this work he acknowledges some help from his friends, the least useful of whom, perhaps, is the "poet" who has furnished so many scraps of verse as chapter headings. Some of these are distressing. Nevertheless we have here a very lively and interesting book, which will prove attractive to the general reader, while, in the main, we judge it will be found quite reliable. The book is written with a heartiness that most persons admire, though it can lay claim to no great literary elegance. He begins his subject with those Egyptian gentlemen who sat bolt upright in straight-backed chairs and complacently hooked their fish in a well-stocked tub, and goes on letting us into all the secrets of angling dis-

covered from that time down to the formation of the latest piscatorial junta. Old Fuller once said of a skillful apiarist, that the bees had told him things or else he had told the bees. The same may be said of our author and the fish, with whom he has a thorough understanding, being perfectly learned in all their ways, and conversant with all their tricks, conceits, and whims, having studied their habits and moods in all sorts of winds and weather, under every variety of sky between dawn and twilight. Our commendation does not, however, so fully apply to what he says of the deep sea fish, and those themes bearing upon the great economic food — fishes. We are sorry to find him indulging, by implication at least, in the belief that there are as many fish in the sea as ever came out of it, instead of putting in an earnest protest against the wholesale butchery of those finny tribes, upon which the welfare of so great a portion of the world largely depends. Whoever has patiently gone over the history of the great deep sea fisheries, which were first brought prominently to notice by the voyages of Cabot and others, but which, probably, under the auspices of the bold Basques, greatly antedated the rediscovery of America by Columbus, and formed a link in the chain of unnoticed, but none the less real, communication maintained with this continent throughout the fifteenth century, cannot have failed to notice the decline of this great interest with alarm; and it should be a part of the duty of every popular writer on the fish question to give the facts of the case and sound the note of warning, since at the present time, while stringent laws are being passed to preserve the rich man's dainty — the comparatively worthless trout — the deep sea fish, the value of which to the human race comparatively few persons rightly estimate, are being treated as those farmers treat their grass who pull it up by the roots to make hay.

Yet we forget that this is not the memorial that ought to be written for presentation to a world's congress, but simply the notice of a new book, which we have examined with much pleasure in all its departments, except that of the commercial fisheries, in which the author is not so much at home. The most of the numerous illustrations accompanying this book are very fair, while the practical angler will find many of them decidedly valuable.

**HYMNS, ANCIENT AND MODERN**, for use in the Services of the Church, with accompanying Tunes. Compiled and arranged under the musical editorship of **WILLIAM HENRY MONK**, Organist and Director of the Choir at King's College, London. New York: Pott & Amery, Cooper Institute, Fourth Avenue. 1869.

**HYMNS, ANCIENT AND MODERN**, for use in the Services of the Church. Pott & Amery, New York. 1869.

We avoid at present a discussion of these editions of "Hymns, Ancient and Modern," because it is designed to devote an Article to the subject of our Hymnology. The triennial discussion and legislation in the General Convention, the constant changes of selection, the wide differences of taste and opinion prevailing throughout the Church, all conspire to show that this department of our worship, is in a state of transition demanding every possible effort to impart to it a wise and permanent impress. Without now entering on any analysis of these volumes, we can yet express our commendation, and trust they will reward the enterprise of the publishers.

**THE CANON OF HOLY SCRIPTURE**, with Remarks upon King James' Version, the Latin Vulgate, and Douay Bibles. By MATTHEW H. HENDERSON, D. D., Rector of Emmanuel Church, Athens, Georgia, formerly Rector of Trinity Church, Newark, N. J. New York: Pott & Amery, Nos. 5 and 13 Cooper Union. 1868.

The title to this volume led us to suppose that it was a manual developing the true principles of fixing the canon of the Scriptures, and ascertaining the office of the Church as the authoritative custodian and interpreter of the Divine Oracles. Such a work is greatly needed to correct the current impression made by many loose writers that the question is to be settled wholly by the opinions of individual Fathers. We have been disappointed that the topic indicated by the title is merely incidental in the book. The work, however, will be found most valuable in exhibiting the errors of Romanists in regard to the Vulgate and Douay translations of the Scriptures. We do not remember to have seen this part of the subject more clearly, or succinctly, or pungently treated. It is indeed amusing to find the infallible edition of the infallible Sixtus V., pronounced authentic by his own infallible words, in two years suppressed and superseded, on account of its manifold errors, by the infallible edition of the infallible Clement VIII., containing the Apocryphal Books, sanctioned by both Tridentine Decree and Papal approval, yet pronounced uncanonical by St. Jerome, the original translator.

**THE TRINITY HYMNAL**, with Offices of Devotion for Sunday and Parish Schools. Pott & Amery. 1868.

**CHURCH TEACHING**, for the Children of the Church. By the Rev. W. H. COOKE, Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York. Pott & Amery. 1869.

**THE CHURCH CATECHISM VERIFIED BY HOLY SCRIPTURE**. By the Rev. WILLIAM SCHOULER, Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Brooklyn, L. I. New York: American Church Press Co., 164 Fulton Street. 1869.

**THE TRINITY CLASS BOOK**. New York: Pott & Amery.

**ELEVEN MONTHS IN HOREB**, being the period of the National and Religious Education of the Israelites. By E. BEDRELL BENJAMIN. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 779 Broadway. 1869.

We have grouped together the volumes named because they are all suggested and animated by the same pious desire to educate in Divine Truth the children of the Church. We most cordially sympathize with the end proposed, and appreciate the labor bestowed, and regret that neither time nor space permit a more extended notice.

**THE FISHER MAIDEN**. A Norwegian Tale. By BJÖRNSTJERNE BJÖRNSON. From the Author's German Edition. By M. E. NILES. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869.

The object of this story is to defend the theatre, by showing the irrepressible instincts of genius, which can only be gratified by dramatic action. A beautiful maiden, with inherited intellectual gifts, appears in a retired village of Norway. Her life is involved in every species of difficulty, contradic-

tion, and absurdity, until, even with the approval of a minister previously opposed, she solves the problem of her being, and escapes its entanglements by histrionic representation amid the brilliant lights and exciting scenes of a crowded theatre. *There* her powers find their proper play. *There* she walks a queen in all the magic beauty and power of native genius. *There* she carries captive all hearts, silences every prejudice, and amid the glow and triumph of the occasion, proves upon her mission the seal of the Deity. The story is well conceived and gracefully told, although in a few instances there are improbabilities of both plot and character. The fires of genius are evidently not extinguished by Norwegian snows. Nay, in this volume we perceive an almost tropical luxuriance of fancy.

REMINISCENCES OF FELIX MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY. A Social and Artistic Biography. By ELISE POLKO. Translated from the German by LADY WALLACE, with additional letters addressed to English Correspondents. New York: Leyboldt & Holt. 1869.

Mendelssohn possessed the spirit of music. His soul seemed a delicate instrument of melodies and harmonies. He breathed his very being into a piano or an orchestra. He swayed audiences with the enthusiasm of his own inspiration. Yet he was more than an artist. He was a *man*. Warm in affection, sincere in purpose, generous in impulse, devoted in aim; with large general powers and wonderful particular gifts, he had every quality to secure private admiration, and to awaken public applause. He was almost an idol among the musical circles of both Germany and England, while his reputation filled the world. Such a man belongs to humanity. Every circumstance of his life is invested with a halo. Genius becomes transfigured in its own glory. This sprightly book, bright with so many recollections of illustrious merit, will have in America as warm a welcome as it has received in Europe.

ALPHABET OF GEOLOGY, AND ELEMENTS OF MINERALOGY. A Treatise designed for Students at School or at Home, and especially adapted to the Advanced Classes of the Common Schools, accompanied by Mineral Specimens of most of the Great Masses of Rock that compose the Globe. By H. T. W. ADAMS, Springfield, Mass. Samuel Bowles & Co. 1868.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW. October, 1868, and January, 1869. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, N. Y.

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW. October, 1868, and January, 1869. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, N. Y.

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW. December, 1868, and March, 1869. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, N. Y.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW. January, 1869, and April, 1869. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, N. Y.

These admirable foreign quarterlies have a special value during the social, political, and religious revolutions which are shaking the very foundations of the venerable government from which our own Republic derived its origin and its impress. They are now more *than* ever indispensable to the scholar and the statesman.

**BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE**, for January, February, March, and April, 1869. The Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 140 Fulton Street, N. Y.

**THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW**. Edited by CHARLES HODGE, D. D., and LYMAN H. ATWATER, D. D., New York. January and April, 1869. Charles Scribner & Co.

**THE NEW ENGLANDER**. Edited by Prof. GEORGE P. FISHER, Prof. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, and WILLIAM KINGSLEY. January and April, 1869. New Haven: printed by Thomas J. Stafford.

**THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY**. January and April, 1869. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 530 Arch Street.

**THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY**. April, 1869. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co., Publishers. 115 and 117 West Fourth Street.

**THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS**. Conducted by Profs. B. SILLIMAN, and JAMES D. DANA, in connection with Profs. ASA GRAY, and WOLCOTT GIBBS, of Cambridge, and Profs. S. W. JOHNSON, GEO. J. BRUSH, and H. A. NEWTON, of New Haven. Second series, vol. XLVII. Numbers for January, March, and May, 1869. New Haven.

**THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY**. Devoted to Literature, Science, and Politics. June, 1869. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co.

**THE CHURCH MONTHLY**. A Catholic Magazine. April, 1869. St. Clement's Press, 1155 Broadway, N. Y.

While we cannot sympathize with the views of the "Monthly" in the latitude it concedes to individual Clergymen in determining Catholic Usage, we admire its earnest zeal, and are pleased with its distinct protests against Papal Supremacy, and its resultant errors.

**THE CHURCH REGISTER**. Milwaukee: May, 1869.

We wish the largest success for this sound and excellent Monthly.

**THE PEOPLE'S MAGAZINE**. London Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, 77 Queen Street, London. Pott & Amery, 5 and 13 Cooper Union, New York.

This Magazine is characterized not only by its variety and sprightliness, but by the superior excellence of its prints and engravings, which are unrivaled among all our religious periodicals.

**HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE**. June, 1869. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square.

We have not yet been able to examine this particular number of "Harper," but have been impressed with the steady improvement of this most popular "Monthly" in the solidity and the interest of its contributions.

**THE RIVERSIDE MAGAZINE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE**. June, 1869. New York: Hurd & Houghton.



**OUR YOUNG FOLKS.** An Illustrated Magazine for Boys and Girls. June, 1869. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.

We only fear that the youth of our country will be rendered too fastidious by the labor and expense lavished by both New York and Boston enterprise, to attract the eye and instruct the mind.

**THE COLONIAL CHURCH CHRONICLE, MISSIONARY JOURNAL, AND FOREIGN ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.** March, April, and May, 1869.

**THE AMERICAN CHURCH MISSIONARY REGISTER.** New York: No. 3 Bible House.

**THE MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER;** a Record of Diocesan Missions in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: King & Baird, 607 Sansom Street. 1869.

**THE SPIRIT OF MISSIONS.** May, 1869. New York: Published for the Board of Missions, No. 18 Bible House.

**DOMESTIC MISSIONARY.** May 15, 1869.

We heartily wish we could place these most admirable issues in the hands of every Churchman in the land. They merit a universal circulation. The "Domestic Missionary" is the offspring of the zeal and ability of the Secretary of the Board it represents, and we need only say that the fires of his own devotion glow in all its pages. He has the sympathies of true Churchmen for the success of his tireless labors.

**THE CHRISTIAN WORLD.** The organ of the American and Foreign Christian Union, May, 1869. New York: Published at No. 27 Bible House.

**THE VILLA ON THE RHINE.** By BERTHOLD AUERBACH. Author's Edition. With a Portrait of the Author, and a Biographical Sketch by BAYARD TAYLOR. Parts I, II, and III. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1869.

**PHINEAS FINN.** By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Illustrated by Malais. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**FOR HER SAKE.** By FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**BREAKING A BUTTERFLY, OR BLANCHE ELLERSLIE'S ENDING.** Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**HE KNEW HE WAS RIGHT.** By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Illustrations by Marcus Stone. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square.

**THAT BOY OF NORCOTT'S.** By CHARLES LEVER, with Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**NATURE'S NOBLEMAN.** By the Author of "Rachel's Secret." New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**KATHLEEN.** By the Author of "Raymond's Heroine." New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**GRIFFITH GAUNT, OR JEALOUSY.** By CHARLES READE, with Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**IT IS NEVER TOO LATE TO MEND.** By CHARLES READE. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1869.

**IS ROMANISM THE BEST RELIGION FOR THE REPUBLIC?** Six Papers from the "American Churchman." New York: Pott & Amery. 1869.

Every reader must have been struck with the ability of our principal papers, such as the "Churchman" of Hartford, the "Church Journal," and the "American Churchman," with others we might mention. The contributions to their columns are far superior in style and learning to those of the secular press, and compare most favorably with those of the best English weeklies. The latter paper we have named is as remarkable for pointed expression as for strong argument. Its editorials, especially, are sprightly, racy, pungent, and if sometimes evincing too great an anxiety to be interesting and impressive, they seldom miss their aim. Certainly they have succeeded admirably and amusingly in their treatment of Father Hecker. He is absolutely annihilated by facts. The fires of his reckless zeal will scarcely hereafter burn with so bright a flame. He will probably long remember the bull of Innocent, annulling Magna Charta, and the encyclical of Pius condemning modern liberty, and scarcely again recommend the Papacy for our Republic. He very much resembles a rash mouse writhing in the claws of its enemy. We hope that liberal men will scatter these papers of Dr. Thompson everywhere over our country, and rejoice that a Clergyman of the Church has struck so powerful a blow at that mighty usurpation which has divided Christendom, and darkened our world.

**OUR LORD THE PATTERN TO THE BISHOPS OF HIS CHURCH.** A Sermon preached in Grace Church, in the City of New York, on the occasion of the Consecration of the Rev. Charles Franklin Robertson, LL. D., as Bishop of Missouri. By HENRY CHAMPLIN LAY, D. D., LL. D. New York: Pott & Amery. 1868.

This discourse, so admirable in plan, in style, in spirit, deserves to be read and pondered by every layman, and Clergyman, and Bishop of the Church.

**WHICH IS THE CHURCH?** or, Which one of the Present Organized Religious Bodies is identical in History and Doctrine with the Church established by the Apostles? By the Rev. G. W. SOUTHWELL, of the Diocese of Western New York. New York. H. B. Durand, No. 11 Bible House. 1869.

**THE PRAYER-BOOK VS. THE PRAYER-BOOK.** Philadelphia. 1869.

We commit the Author of this anonymous pamphlet to the guardianship of the venerable Bishop of Ohio, who has answered his sophistries.

**SERMONS** preached before the Bishop Seabury Association of Brown University, Providence, R. I. With a Preface, by the Rev. HENRY WATERMAN, D. D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church. New York. 1868.

However Dr. Dix and Dr. Ewer may receive censure for particular opinions and practices, no man who hears, or reads these discourses will question their

piety, their ability, or their loyal devotion to the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

**THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF NATURAL SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.** An Oration pronounced before the Connecticut Beta of the Phi-Beta-Kappa Society, in Christ Church, Hartford, Conn., July 7, 1868. By the Rev. WILLIAM RUDDER, Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia. Henry Bushmead, 1102 and 1104 Sansom Street. 1869.

Dr. Rudder has discussed his subject in a masterly manner. His argument, always sound, clear, conclusive, often glows into eloquence. We recommend our young men to study this sermon.

**ON THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF LIFE.** By T. H. HUXLEY, LL. D., F. R. S. Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

We have never in the same space seen the principles of the inductive philosophy so ignored as in this singular Lecture. Because in the veins of plants and animals a certain substance is found called Protoplasm, this is therefore the basis of life. The mere fact of its universal presence is the sole proof of its vivifying energy. Yet this is the argument of a Comtist, who believes only what he sees and understands. No wonder such men deny their immortality and their God. We are not informed whether the students or the professors of Yale College have published this materialism of Professor Huxley.

**THE ARTS AND SCIENCES.** Catalogue of Importation. Scribner, Welford, & Co., 654 Broadway, N. Y.

**VICK'S ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE AND FLORAL GUIDE.** 1869.

**THE SYSTEM OF COMMERCIAL TRAVELLING IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES,** its History, Customs, and Laws. Riverside Press. 1869.

**PRO ECCLESIA SANCTA CATHOLICA.** Rev. Dr. EWER. 1869.

**THE HOUSE OF GOD THE HOME OF ALL THE FAITHFUL.** By the Rt. Rev. R. H. WILMER, D. D., Bishop of Alabama. Second Edition. Savannah, Ga. : E. J. Purse, Printer. 1868.

We have read no recent discourse which breathes a more Catholic spirit, or more ably expounds the true position and mission of the Church.

**THE BAPTISMAL NEW BIRTH "OF WATER AND THE SPIRIT."** By Rev. WM. ALLEN FISKE, A. M., Rector of St. Paul's Annunciate. Bradley & Power. 1869.

This Sermon is exceeding suggestive, and with that of Mr. Fiske so ably exposing voluntarism, deserves a wide circulation.

**THE CHOICE OF A BISHOP ON SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES.** The Sermon preached at the opening of the Primary Convention of the Diocese of Central New York, November 11, 1868. By A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York. Utica, N. Y. : Curtis & Childs. 1869.

The words of eloquent and weighty warning in this impressive discourse, deserve a larger comment than our space permits. While tending to check our American precipitancy, it yet breathes with all the fire and vigor of our age.

THE TRIENNIAL REPORT OF THE RT. REV. GEORGE M. RANDALL, D. D., Missionary Bishop of Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. 1868.

It is labors such as are disclosed in this Report which are to make the life of the Church pulsate through the Great West, and inspire the highest hopes of her universal triumph.

D. APPLETON & Co.'s MONTHLY BULLETIN. April, 1869. New York.

THE ADDRESS OF STEPHEN P. NASH, Esq., President of the American Church Union. February 11, 1869.

CAROL WORDS FOR THE HOLY TIDES. Chandler. Philadelphia.

REPORT OF THE FOURTH TRIENNIAL MEETING of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry and of the Board of Directors. Held in Zion Church and Calvary Church, New York, October 11th and 12th, 1868. Hartford: Wiley, Waterman, & Eaton. 1868.

THE BOOK BUYER. Scribner, Welford, & Co., 654 Broadway, N. Y.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS of the Church Union in Columbia College, New York. 1869. American Church Press Co.

BIBLE SOCIETY RECORD. May, 1869.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS of the Nashotah Theological Seminary. 1868-69. Milwaukee: Hawks & Bendick.

MODERN SYSTEM OF PAINTING IN WATER COLORS FROM THE LIVING MODEL. By Mrs. ELIZABETH MURRAY. Riverside Press: Hurd & Houghton. 1869.

ZELL'S POPULAR ENCYCLOPEDIA AND UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY. Edited by L. COLANGE. Philadelphia.

DIOCESE OF NEW JERSEY, ST. MARY'S HALL REGISTER. Thirty-first year. Philadelphia: King & Baird. 1868.

REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE, Racine, Wisconsin, for the Academical year 1868-69. Milwaukee: Hawks & Bendick. 1869.

DIOCESE OF ILLINOIS, Seventeenth Annual Address.

DIOCESE OF MAINE, Forty-Ninth Annual Convention. 1868.

DIOCESE OF ALBANY, Primary Convention. 1868.

CATALOGUE OF THE OFFICERS AND STUDENTS OF HOBART COLLEGE, for the Academical year 1868-69. Geneva, N. Y.: S. H. Parker.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL AND EDUCATIONAL ALMANAC. By ALEXANDER J. SCHEM. 15 Dey Street, N. Y.

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH OF ST. JOHN, in Dresden, as adopted at a Meeting held on Easter Monday, April 29, 1869. B. G. Trübner, Dresden.

# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Rt. Rev. Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Banister, T. Lewis,	Wilmer,	Nov. 12,	Trinity Ch., Mobile, Ala.
Bonner, Archibald David,	Coxe,	Dec. 20,	St. Paul's, Buffalo.
Boyer, Levi,	Eastburn,	March 2,	St. Saviour, Longwood.
Brent, Roland,	Cummins,	April 18,	Ascension Ch., Frankfort, Ky.
Davis, Joel,	Potter,	Nov. 14,	St. Luke's, N. Y. City.
Degen, H. V.	"	Dec. 20,	Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
Dunham, Warren Nelson,	Talbot,	Nov. 25,	St. Paul's, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Ely, William A.	Coxe,	Nov. 15,	St. Paul's, Paris, N. Y.
Ezra, Isaac,	Lee,	Nov. 11,	Davenport, Ia.
Harris, Samuel S.	Wilmer,	Feb. 10,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
Hibben, William Wallace,	Talbot,	March 22,	St. Paul's, Richmond, Ind.
Hovey, Henry Emerson,	Williams,	Feb. 21,	St. Ann's, Lowell, Mass.
Jones, Curtis P.	Odenheimer,	Jan. 10,	Grace Ch., Jersey City.
Kellog, Charles H.	Cummins,	Dec. 28,	Trinity Ch., Covington, Ky.
Kimber, Joshua,	Littlejohn,	Feb. 19,	St. George's, Flushing, L. I.
Lawrence, Arthur,	Eastburn,	March 2,	St. Saviour, Longwood.
Lee, James H.	"	"	"
Leopold, Simonson,	Williams,	Nov. 27,	Col. Chapel, Hartford.
McKee, John M. E.	Whittingham,	"	St. John's, Washington, D. C.
Patterson, James,	Clarkson,	April 4,	St. Mary's, Nebraska City.
Pettigrew, Wm. Sheppard,	Atkinson,	Jan. 31,	St. James, Wilmington, N. C.
Raikes, Frederick Walter,	Coxe,	Dec. 20,	St. Paul's, Buffalo.
Shoup, F. A.	Green,	"	St. Peter's, Oxford, Miss.
Tucker, James L.	"	Dec. 19,	St. Paul's, Columbus, Miss.
Tune, Walter,	Smith,	March 28,	" Newport, Ky.
Wicks, John B.	Coxe,	Nov. 15,	St. Peter's, Paris, N. Y.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Rt. Rev. Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Anderson, A. Peyton,	Kip,	March 3,	Trinity Ch., San Jose, Cal.
" Barrow, Alfred J.	Morris,	Dec. 16,	Christ Ch., Phila.
" Buck, George,	Williams,	March 20,	Trinity Ch., Hartford.
" Buscoe, James,	Whittingham.	"	"
" Capens, Wm. Henry,	Doane,	Feb. 20,	St. Peter's, Albany.
" Carmichael, James,	Smith,	March 18,	Ascension Ch., Frankfort.
" Clark, J. W.	Williams,	Jan. 20,	St. Andrews, Meriden.
" Coale, W. A.	Whittingham.	"	"
" Converse, John Holmes,	Williams,	Dec. 16,	Chapel Berkley, Divin. Sch.
" Craigbill, James B.	Williams,	Jan. 24,	St. Andrews, Meriden.
" Davidson, A.	Potter,	Dec. 20,	Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
" Dennison, R. E.	"	"	"
" Earp, Samuel,	Kerfoot,	Feb. 17,	St. Stephen's, Sewickly, Pa.
" Faust, A. Jerome,	Whittingham,	Dec. 27,	St. John's, Washington, D. C.
" Forbes, John Irving,	Doane,	Feb. 20,	St. Peter's, Albany.
" Garduer, E. C.	Williams,	Jan. 24,	St. Andrew's, Meriden.

Name.	Rt. Rev. Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Rev. Green, Duncan Cameron,	Green,	Dec. 10,	Grace Ch., Canton, Miss.
" Huntington, G. P.	Huntington,	April 9,	Emmanuel Ch., Boston.
" Hutchinson, Thos. Poole,	Clarkson,	Feb. 14,	Trinity Ch., Omaha.
" Ireland, John,	Potter,	Feb. 2,	Immanuel Ch., Bethlehem.
" Jennings, D'Estaing,	Coxe,	Jan. 18,	St. Paul's, Syracuse.
" Lewis, W. H. Jr.	Williams,	Jan. 6,	St. James, Winsted, Conn.
" Mead, Samuel H.	Morris,	Dec. 16,	Christ Ch., Phila.
" Nevin, Robert I.	Potter,	Feb. 2,	Immanuel Ch., Bethlehem.
" Olmsted, C. T.	"	Dec. 20,	Trinity Chapel, N. Y. City.
" Ritchie, Robert,	Eastburn,	Feb. 17,	St. Mark's, Boston.
" Saunders, E. H.	Williams,	April 13,	Trinity Ch., Norwich.
" Smith, Hoyt James,	Kip,	Feb. 21,	St. Paul's, Benicia, Cal.
" Smith, Henry G.	Potter,	April 11,	St. Paul's, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
" Sylvester, W. W.	Williams,	April 13,	Trinity Ch., Norwich.

## CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS.

Name.	Rt. Rev. Bishops.	Time.	Place.
Rev. Doane William Croswell,	{ Potter, Littlejohn, Odenheimer, Neely,	Feb. 2,	St. Peter's, Albany.
Rev. Huntington Frederick Dan,	{ Potter, Clark, Randall, Neely, Morris, Doane,	April 8,	Emmanuel Ch., Boston.
Rev. Littlejohn Abr'm Newkirk,	{ Potter, Johns, Odenheimer, Coxe, Clarkson, Randall, Morris,	Jan. 27,	Holy Trinity, Brooklyn.
Rev. Morris Benjamin Wistar,	{ Lee, Clarkson, Kerfoot, Vale, Randall,	Dec. 3,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia.

## CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.

Name.	Rt. Rev. Bishop.	Time.	Place.
Chapel of Incarnation,	Williams,	Nov. 18,	Hartford.
Christ Church,	Whipple,	Dec. 29,	Frontenac, Minn.
Christ's Church,	Johns,	April 5,	Culpepper, Va.
St. James's Chapel,	Morris,	Jan. 4,	Lancaster, Pa.
Trinity Church,	Eastburn,	Sept. 24,	Vandeusenville, Mass.
Trinity Church,	Talbot,	Nov. 19,	Ft. Wayne, Ind.

## CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

WILLIAM WALLACE HIBBEN, formerly a Methodist Minister.